



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Princeton University Library



32101 065273144



0901  
N545

6

Library of



Princeton University.









THE  
NEW ENGLANDER.

NULLIUS ADDICTUS JURARE IN VERBA MAGISTRI.

VOLUME VI.—1848.

NEW HAVEN:  
PUBLISHED BY A. H. MALTBY.

PRINTED BY B. L. HAMLEN,  
Printer to Yale College.

	Page.
J. P. Thompson,	457
M. Richardson,	473
E. O. Dunning,	482
T. Edwards,	499
Incog.,	513
I. F. Tuttle,	524
E. R. Tyler,	534
— March,	543
G. H. Hollister,	548
C. S. Renshaw,	557
W. W. Andrews,	577
Incog.,	590
L. Bacon,	603

---

H. N. Day,	381.
J. Leavitt,	153, 393.
S. Harris,	155.
J. P. Warren,	177.
H. D. Kitchel,	194.
M. Richardson,	204.
A. P. Marvin,	219.
S. W. S. Dutton,	230, 431.
B. N. Martin,	299.
J. P. Thompson,	263.
Timothy Dwight,	281.
Leonard Bacon,	292, 440.
T. A. Thacher,	302
E. R. Tyler,	304, 357, 418.
Charles Hammond,	313.
Thomas Hastings,	424.
Mrs. D. E. Sykes,	344.
J. L. Kingsley,	378.
Denison Olmsted,	404.

## C O N T E N T S O F V O L U M E V I .

---

### No. I.

	Page.
<b>Church Building, - - - - -</b>	1
<b>Webster's Dictionary, - - - - -</b>	24
An American Dictionary of the English Language. By Noah Webster, LL.D. Revised and Enlarged by Chauncey A. Goodrich, Professor in Yale College: with Pronouncing Vocabularies of Scripture, Classical and Geographical Names.	
<b>Missionary Operations in Polynesia, - - - - -</b>	41
Omoo ; by Herman Melville.	
<b>Voices of Freedom, - - - - -</b>	58
Voices of Freedom ; by J. G. Whittier.	
<b>Dewey's Controversial Writings, - - - - -</b>	67
Discourses and Reviews, upon questions in Controversial Theology, and Practical Religion. By Orville Dewey, D.D., Pastor of the Church of the Messiah in New York.	
<b>Christian Comprehensiveness, - - - - -</b>	81
<b>Post-Office Reform, - - - - -</b>	111
<b>Bushnell on Christian Nurture, - - - - -</b>	121
Views of Christian Nurture, and of subjects adjacent thereto ; by Horace Bushnell.	
<b>The Financial Crisis of Great Britain, - - - - -</b>	147
<b>Short Notices, - - - - -</b>	151
Traill's New Translation of Josephus.—Williston on the Sabbath.—Todd's Shorter Catechism.	

### No. II.

<b>The British System of Postage, - - - - -</b>	153
<b>Upham's Life of Madame Guyon, - - - - -</b>	165
Life and religious opinions and experience of Madame de la Mothe Guyon ; together with some account of the personal history and religious opinions of Fenelon, Archbishop of Cambray. By Thomas C. Upham, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Bowdoin College.	

(RECAP)

JUL -61915 337673

Digitized by Google

	Page.
Putney Perfectionism, - - - - -	177
The Berean : a manual for the help of those who seek the faith of the primitive church. By John H. Noyes.	
Religious Toleration, - - - - -	194
The Relation of Education to the Well-being of States, - - - - -	207
Eleventh Annual Report of the Massachusetts Board of Education, together with the Eleventh Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board.	
Postscript to the Article above, - - - - -	312
Robert Murray McCheyne, - - - - -	219
The works of the late Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne, Minister of St. Peter's Church, Dundee. Complete in two volumes. Vol. 1, containing his Life and Remains, Letters, Lectures, Songs of Zion, &c.	
The Proposed Substitution of Sectarian for Public Schools, - - - - -	230
Supplement to the Article above, - - - - -	299
Rev. Mr. Bellows on the Moral Government of God, - - - - -	249
1. Relation of Christianity to Human Nature.—A Sermon preached at the ordination of Mr. Frederick Knapp as colleague Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Brookline, Mass., on Wednesday, Oct. 6, 1847.	
2. Nature of the Atonement.—A Discourse delivered by appointment of the Synod of New York and New Jersey, on Wednesday evening, Oct. 20, 1847. By Rev. Thomas H. Skinner, Pastor of the Mercer Street Presbyterian Church, New York.	
3. Doctrine of the Atonement.—The Christian Inquirer.	
Ireland : her Sufferings and their Remedy, - - - - -	263
Ireland in 1847: its present state and prospects. By J. Wilson Browne.	
Thoughts on the Poor-relief Bill for Ireland: together with reflections on her miseries, their causes, and their remedies. By John, Earl of Shrewsbury.	
Irish Sufferers, and Anti-Irish Philosophers; their pledges and performances. By Eneas MacDonnell, Esq., Barrister-at-law.	
Reply to the Speech of the Archbishop of Dublin, against the Poor-relief (Ireland) Bill. By G. Poulett Scrope, Esq., M. P., &c.	
Paddiana: or Scraps and Sketches of Irish life, present and past.	
Ireland's Welcome to the Stranger: or an excursion through Ireland, in 1844 and 1845, for the purpose of personally investigating the condition of the poor. By A. Nicholson.	
A Lecture on the antecedent causes of the Irish Famine in 1847, by the Rt. Rev. John Hughes, D. D.	
Impressions of Ireland and the Irish.	

	Page.
England and the United States :—Agriculture, Manufactures and Railroads, - - - - -	281
Peace—and what next? - - - - -	292
Literary Notices, - - - - -	302

The Germania and Agricola of Caius Cornelius Tacitus, with notes for Colleges.—Apostolical Constitutions. Translated from the German; by Irrah Chase, D. D.—The Philosophy of Christian Perfection, embracing a Psychological statement of some of the principles of Christianity on which the doctrine rests.—Torrey's Neander. General History of the Christian Religion and Church. By Joseph Torrey.—Cleveland's Compendium of English Literature.—Chalmers' Miscellanies.—Schmitz's History of Rome.—Hydraulics and Mechanics. In five books. By Thomas Ewbank.—Miscellaneous Essays; by Mark Hopkins, D. D.—A Practical Course of French Grammar, based on Ollendorff's new method. By G. J. Hubert Sanders.—Notes Critical, Explanatory and Practical on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah. By Albert Barnes.—Notices of Pamphlets.

## No. III.

Common Schools and their relations to Higher Seminaries, - - - - -	313
Principles in the Art of Landscape, - - - - -	331
Memoir of Mrs. Mary E. Van Lennep, - - - - -	344
Memoir of Mrs. Mary E. Van Lennep, only daughter of the Rev. Joel Hawes, D.D., and wife of the Rev. Henry J. Van Lennep, Missionary in Turkey. By her Mother. Hartford: Belknap and Hammersly.	
Proposed Abolition of Slavery in West Virginia, - - - - -	357
Address to the People of West Virginia; showing that slavery is injurious to the public welfare, and that it may be gradually abolished, without detriment to the rights and interests of slaveholders. By a Slaveholder of West Virginia. Lexington: Printed by R. C. Noel. 1847.	
Chronology, - - - - -	378
Dr. Jarvis's Vindication. Church Review for April, 1848.	
Our Post-Office, - - - - -	393
Report of the Post-Master General of the United States, for the year ending June 30, 1847. Documents accompanying the President's Message, 1st Session, 30th Congress, December, 1847.	
Laws and Regulations of the Post-Office Department. 1847.	
Thoughts on the Riches of the Natural World, - - - - -	404

	Page.
<b>The Church—as it was, as it is, as it ought to be,</b> - - - - -	<b>418</b>
<b>Church Music,</b> - - - - -	<b>424</b>
<b>The French Revolution of 1848,</b> - - - - -	<b>431</b>
<b>The Ethics of the Right of Suffrage,</b> - - - - -	<b>441</b>
<b>Literary Notices,</b> - - - - -	<b>453</b>

**The Genius of Scotland; or Sketches of Scottish Scenery, Literature and Religion; by Robert Turnbull.—Religion Teaching by Example; by Richard W. Dickinson, D.D.—Fundamental Philosophy, or Elements of Primitive Philosophy; being the first Division of a Complete System of Philosophical Science. From the German of William Traugott Krug.—Posthumous Influence: A Sermon occasioned by the death of the Hon. Samuel Hubbard, LL. D., Associate Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts; by Silas Aiken.—A Good Man Lamented: A Sermon preached in the First Congregational Church, Canandaigua, N. Y., at the funeral of Walter Hubbell; by the Pastor of the Church, O. E. Daggett.**

#### No. IV.

<b>Ireland,</b> - - - - -	<b>457</b>
<b>The Mission of Labor,</b> - - - - -	<b>473</b>
<b>Martial Men and Martial Books,</b> - - - - -	<b>482</b>
<i>Washington and his Generals, by J. T. Headley.</i>	
<b>Review of Dr. Spring's "Power of the Pulpit,"</b> - - - - -	<b>499</b>
<i>The Power of the Pulpit; or thoughts addressed to Christian Ministers, and those who hear them. By Gardiner Spring, D.D., Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian church, New York.</i>	
<b>Christ in History,</b> - - - - -	<b>513</b>
<b>Our Late Conquests,</b> - - - - -	<b>524</b>
<b>The Ethics of Religious Controversy,</b> - - - - -	<b>534</b>
<b>The Relation of the Study of Jurisprudence to the origin and progress of the Baconian Philosophy,</b> - - - - -	<b>543</b>
<b>Review of Longfellow's "Evangeline,"</b> - - - - -	<b>548</b>
<i>Evangeline, by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.</i>	
<b>Historical and Statistical View of the Working of Emancipation in Jamaica,</b> - - - - -	<b>557</b>
<b>National Unity,</b> - - - - -	<b>577</b>

	Page.
<b>Modern French Literature, - - - - -</b>	<b>590</b>
Modern French Literature. By L. Raymond de Véricour, formerly Lecturer in the Royal Athénéeum, Paris, &c. &c. Revised, with notes alluding particularly to writers prominent in late political events in Paris; by William Staughton Chase, A.M.	
<b>Literary Notices, - - - - -</b>	<b>595</b>
Peter Schlemihl in America.—The Crescent and the Cross; or Ro- mance and Realities of Eastern Travel; by Eliot Warburton, Esq. —An Oration delivered before the Society of Phi Beta Kappa, at Cambridge, August 24, 1848; by Horace Bushnell.—A History of New York, from the Beginning of the World, to the End of the Dutch Dynasty; by Diedrich Knickerbocker.—The Planetary and Stellar Worlds; by O. M. Mitchell, A.M.—Elements of Meteor- ology, with Questions for Examination: designed for the use of Schools and Academies; by John Brocklesby, A.M.—The His- tory of the Reformation, in the Church of Christ, from the close of the Fifteenth Century; by Thomas Gaillard.—Sermons and Ad- dresses on various subjects; by Rev. D. L. Carroll, D.D.—Sprink- ling the only Mode of Baptism made known in the Scriptures: and the Scripture Warrant for Infant Baptism; by Abealom Peters, D.D. —Young Men admonished; in a series of Lectures; by Joseph P. Thompson.—The Illustrated Family Christian Almanac, for 1849. —Cottages and Cottage Life; by C. W. Elliott.	
<b>Obituary Notice of Rev. EDWARD R. TYLER, - - - - -</b>	<b>603</b>

#### ERRATA.—No. I.

P. 6, column 2, line 8 from top, before *in*, insert *as*.  
" 14, " 1, line 12 from bottom, for *stripe* read *strip*.  
" 15, " 1, line 28 from top, for *manifest*, read *manifold*.  
" 17, " 2, line 5 from top, for *partitions*, read *portions*.  
" 19, " 2, line 3 from top, for *a man*, read *men*.

#### ERRATA.—VOLUME V.

Page 486, column 1, line 2, for *some*, read *so we*.  
" 488, " 2, " 21, for *just*, read *kind*.  
" 490, " 1, " 27, for *neater*, read *greater*.  
" 492, " 1, " 9 from bottom, for *true*, read *three*.  
" 492, " 2, " 18 from top, for *quā*, read *quā*.

THE  
NEW ENGLANDER.

No. XXI.

---

JANUARY, 1848.

---

CHURCH BUILDING.

THE Puritans were 'a peculiar people,' not only in the sense in which the apostles affirmed as much of Christians generally, because they were among God's own redeemed servants, but according to the sense often imputed to the phrase, as being obviously singular or different from the multitude. It could not have been reasonably expected of men in their situation, that they would be equally judicious in all the particulars about which they were precise and rigid, nor that all their scruples would alike commend themselves to the imitation of their posterity. In some things we can easily see that their very position made them antagonistic, and prone to extremes. It is a fruit of the essential Puritan spirit inherited from the fathers of New England, that their descendants, instead of clinging with blind tenacity to all the traditions received from an ancestry of which they rightly boast, make use of the freedom they obtain from the same source, adapt themselves to their own times, and modify their opinions and usages in some measure according to their opportunities of advancement.

Thus our fathers are known to have differed from the established church of England not only in certain im-

portant matters of doctrine, polity and discipline, but in regard to ecclesiastical architecture also; on which subject we believe their real views have been misrepresented and misunderstood, while at the same time we can not adopt them as the model or example of our own. They entertained scruples about names as well as things. Their houses of worship they would not call churches, nor was this name *popularized* among their descendants in New England even within our memory, if indeed it can be said to be so at this day. But as a part of the British people, yet dissenters from the two national establishments, they were obliged to relinquish a name legally appropriated to the edifices used by those ecclesiastical bodies, just as now in England all houses of worship other than Episcopal, and in Scotland those which are Episcopal, are not called churches, but by way of distinction chapels. Apart from this necessity however, they objected to such an application of the word *church*, and not without grave reasons. It is not the scriptural name of a place of worship, but rather of a worshiping assembly, 'a congregation of faithful men,' or of all such congregations collectively considered. And so generally is it used to

denote the 'spiritual house,' that when applied to a material edifice it must be expounded by the connection it stands in, and sometimes creates ambiguity. But in rejecting this term the non-conformists, were not happy in providing a substitute. They fell upon a compound awkward at best, and doomed to be contracted and corrupted in frequent use into "meetin' us." On grave occasions which allow of longer phrases, the difficulty has been obviated by the use of those scriptural expressions which have always been employed more or less among all Christians, 'the house of God,' 'the Lord's house,' and 'the *sanctuary*.' This last term, or perhaps the word *temple*, more familiar to us in Jewish than in heathen usage, should have been employed rather than any modern compound, as being at once appropriate, specific, brief and elegant; and either of these terms might have retained a paramount place in those communities where it had been once established. We admit, however, that it was not wise to attempt to displace a name at once sacred and popular among the greater part of all who speak our mother tongue, for no better reasons than its occasional ambiguity and the want of scriptural precedent. To call a house of worship a *church*, if not scriptural nor entirely unequivocal, is yet emphatically *English*. There are still Congregationalists who from habit or deference to the fathers prefer the awkward compound, and there are religionists of other orders who like to perpetuate it by way of reproach against all Protestant churches except their own.\* For ourselves, when we

would be brief, we are content to call every place of Christian worship, a church, with or without 'the consent' of the fathers of New England, or of their traducers.

But we have more to do now with things than names. Houses of worship in New England, as in other parts of this country, are known to have been from the first plain buildings, more remarkable for the good service rendered in them to God and man, than for sumptuous decorations or architectural beauty. As a part of the historical view that ought to be taken of the topic proposed in this article, we would briefly advert to the opinion and practice of the people of New England in early times, or before the present century. As we said before, they have been misrepresented, and misunderstood on this subject. By some they are supposed to have set themselves in prejudice and opposition against the idea of any other church-architecture than such as was absolutely necessary to accommodate an audience within four walls; but this was not true of the Puritans, though it may have been of the Quakers. They did not employ the most costly nor the most substantial materials, nor follow the most approved models of proportion, nor in any way aim chiefly at the most imposing effect; but this was a matter of course in a new country, among people who were laying the foundations of new commonwealths, and whose most urgent care was the defense, subsistence and nurture of their children. No people, in such a condition, build stone cathedrals to be wondered at by their posterity. The houses of worship in New England from the earliest period might be favorably compared with structures of the same kind, and of even later

\* Thereby hangs a tale. In a certain place a Congregational church stood between another of the same order and an Episcopal edifice. A minister in the latter received a notice to be read from the desk, of some public meeting during the week 'in the Center church.' In his young zeal he concluded, against the advice of another minister, to read it, 'the

Center meeting-house.' 'What have you been about,' said the other, after the service, 'calling our church a meeting-house—for it must be one if the other is the center meeting-house.' The dilemma was candidly acknowledged.

date, in the southern colonies, and in the Canadas too, where the prevailing religion, so far as religion prevailed at all, was of a type opposed to Puritanism. When their resources are considered, our fathers are found to have been liberal in expenditures of this sort. They built not only for themselves, but as far as the materials they were able to employ would suffice, for their descendants. Many of the old parish churches, such as stood within the memory of the present generation, and even yet survive, were larger than most of their successors, and constructed of huge beams and rafters, that modern workmen would call a waste of timber. The wood was sometimes brought from a great distance, and selected with care and cost. Hence those structures often lasted longer than many modern brick churches, which have to be taken down before they would fall of themselves on account of some crack in the wall, or because they are 'out of fashion.' And it should be observed as honorable to those times, that the house of God was more costly than any private dwelling. The same thing can not be as generally affirmed now. The chief men studied the Old Testament too much to leave any of them content to say, 'I dwell in an house of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth within curtains.'\* Yet it is undoubtedly true that the laws of taste in this department were then too little considered or understood. The same care and expense would have been bestowed more wisely, if more regard had been had to approved models either in classic or Gothic architecture. We are willing to admit also, that on this subject their judgment lay under a certain unnatural bias. Having taken an attitude in opposition to the prevailing party in the church of England in regard to more important points,

they were predisposed to differ from them also in opinion and usages on matters of inferior moment, and among other things in the structure and arrangement of houses of worship. There was some need too of innovation and reform in this matter.

The old English churches were not as convenient as they ought to have been for the purposes of worship and instruction. The cathedrals especially were fitted, as in fact they had been designed, for popish rather than Protestant use—for seeing the ceremonies of the Romish church, rather than intelligently worshiping God and hearing his word even according to the usages of the English church since the reformation. Their magnitude and arrangement show them to have been products of the old superstition, since they would never have been demanded for the purposes of a purer faith. The world may well congratulate itself on the possession of such architectural wonders; for ourselves if we were permitted often to see them we could heartily honor the memory of their ancient builders for the pleasure afforded us by those fruits of their mistaken zeal, and we would have more enlightened generations religiously preserve the edifices which we could not justify them for now erecting. At the same time we can not resist the conviction that in these instances costly magnificence was in excess; that the arts of decoration transcended the limits prescribed by the simplicity of the Christian institutions, and that the sublime effect thus sought was disproportioned to other more spiritual and benevolent aims. There was, therefore, as we have said, some need of reform in this matter of church building where a pure and vital Christianity was to be reinstated in the minds of the common people. We acknowledge, however, that many of the Puritans were misled by their position beyond this legitimate design, into lower and

\* 2 Sam. 7: 2. 1 Chron. 17: 1.

narrower notions. Their antipathy to an ecclesiastical establishment whose usages they properly regarded as still impregnated with too much of the old leaven, and whose tyranny they had felt with righteous indignation, made them jealous even of things accidentally associated with that establishment. Cooper in one of his novels says, that from their anxiety to differ from the communion they had left, they made their church-windows as nearly as possible like those of private houses. Whether this be so or not, some such motive seems to have entered into their architectural arrangements, making them more partial than they would otherwise have been to a style excessively plain, or more properly bald and homely. Probably some influence of this kind led them to prefer two and even three rows of small windows to one row of long windows.\* Yet on the other hand, they did not run into the theory of the Quakers or the Methodists on this subject. Some of the old churches that stood within the memory of the present generation, and some of which are still standing here and there, besides being built as substantially as the materials would allow, were not destitute of ornament. The pulpits particularly were sometimes adorned with carved work in the form of vines or flowers, or enriched capitals of pilasters, and generally with more panels and mouldings than any part of the best dwelling-house at that time could show, and being built up solid from the floor and to an unnecessary height, beneath a sounding-board which had more or less work on it too, made more considerable structures than the modern platform surmounted by a table or fenced in by a balustrade and curtain. And it

ought to be observed by the good people now engaged in erecting houses of worship, that if through prejudice or lack of judgment, 'the old fashioned meeting-houses,' as they are called, differed unnecessarily from the English parish churches, yet in one important respect they conformed to those models,—in having the tower rise from the ground, instead of resting on the roof, or partly on the roof and partly on a colonnade, as in many new churches at this day. We have seen old churches spoiled in the best feature they ever had, because the people attempted to improve them, as they imagined, by bringing forward the main building on each side even (or 'flush,' as carpenters have it) with the front of the tower, thus making the steeple seem to rest on the roof even where it has a better support and ought to show it. But we shall advert to this point again. We have said enough to show that our fathers, down to the present century, when we consider their circumstances, were not so far behind their descendants of the present day in the matter of church building, as is often supposed. Still we acknowledge that here, as in some other things, their judgment was not as comprehensive and liberal as it should have been. In revolting from one extreme they tended to another. They did not give the idea of beauty its legitimate place in the arts, nor yet always in the conduct of life. In ecclesiastical architecture it was too far subordinated to the bare cold notion of utility or convenience. Their error, more excusable in them however, was that of a majority of the people in our own day; and the correction of it will mark the more advanced stages and show one of the ripest fruits of the world's civilization. We hold it to be true, and we would have the truth sacredly regarded, that as in nature, so in human life, and in the arts, utility and beauty

\* Yet something like a precedent might be found for so many tiers of lights in old Norman churches as described by scientific writers.

instead of being lawfully divorced are of right joined together, and that the highest perfection of each lies in the harmony of both.

While of late years we see encouraging tokens among all the leading denominations of Christians, of a desire to diversify and improve ecclesiastical architecture, we are obliged to add that in most places there is more of diversity than of improvement, and that so far as the proper effect of the exterior is considered, the new church falls short of the old. We have often wished that some of the long established congregations in New England, had been from the first in a condition to use the most enduring materials for building, that we might sometimes worship God in 'our holy,' if not 'our beautiful house, where our fathers praised' him. Besides the effect of historical associations, 'the old house,' with certain slight changes for the sake of convenience, would often have the advantage over the new, in looking more like a place of worship, and less like a court house or academy or factory. Here and there one may still be found, too strong to be easily pulled apart, and too hallowed 'for the fathers' sakes' to be readily forsaken. The last we looked into with curious interest was in Lexington, Massachusetts, and that (if we are rightly informed) has since been burnt, after witnessing the first bloodshed of the Revolution, and surviving theological changes scarcely less memorable. Though we saw it in the latter part of the week, on opening the door we found the house redolent of fennel-seed, which as many of our readers may remember, had a fragrance almost as ecclesiastical in the country towns in New England as frankincense in the Romish churches, though employed to stimulate the senses rather than to becloud the fancy. The pulpit was midway on one side of the building, a tall paneled structure, the up-

per part of the center projecting, if we remember rightly, in three sides of a hexagon, with 'the deacons' seat' below, a single steep heavy staircase at the side, and a little window behind. The chief door was opposite the pulpit, making the side of the house the front, (as an Irish critic might describe it,) and another door at either end, one passing through the tower, where we suppose the boys stopped every Sunday to understand the mystery of bell-ringing. The 'seating' was in square pews, left unpainted as they should be, with large and small aisles through which the people who had been accustomed to such passes could find the shortest way from either door. There may have been a sounding board too over the pulpit, for this was once thought almost indispensable, and besides having the authority of old precedent, was of more service than is now imagined.\* It might be employed with advantage now wherever the size or shape of a house, or the feebleness of a preacher's voice, makes hearing difficult. At one time another sort of sounding board, not so called, was in use in some places if

\* "The church of Attercliffe, near Sheffield, (England,) had long been remarkable for the difficulty and indistinctness with which the voice from the pulpit was heard: these defects were completely remedied by the erection of a concave sounding board, having the form resulting from half a revolution of one branch of a parabola on its axis. It is made of pine wood; its axis is inclined forward to the plane of the floor at an angle of about ten or fifteen degrees; it is elevated so that the speaker's mouth may be in the focus; and a small curvilinear portion is removed on each side from beneath, so that the view of the preacher from the side galleries may not be intercepted. The effect of this sounding board has been to increase the volume of the sound to nearly five times what it was before, so that the voice is now distinctly audible in the remotest parts of the church, and more especially in those places, however distant they may be, which are situated in the prolongation of the axis of the paraboloid."—*Stuart's Dict. of Archit.*

not generally: the seats were divided into parts and made to turn on hinges, so as to be laid up against the back of the pews in prayer-time, in order that the people might lean against the pew-rails in standing up, and when prayer was over they were let down with a slam throughout the house. Another circumstance better worth imitation was the height of the pews\* in old times, which gave a convenient support to the congregation standing in prayer. The people who now commend the fathers for maintaining that attitude, and would perpetuate the custom, should consider that the low partitions now common between the pews make it more fatiguing than of old, and have done much to bring about a change in the habits of our congregations. Another peculiarity which we remember in some of the old churches, might be restored with advantage at least in our smaller edifices: the staircases leading to the gallery were contained within the audience-room, in the angles of the house, instead of being in the porch as now. Wherever there is a gallery there can be no need of concealing the necessary access to it, but on the contrary a staircase, if properly made, may very properly be shown, as a thing obviously in its place; and by having it in the house, less room is needed for the porch.<sup>t</sup> But the old churches excelled most of their successors chiefly in what we have already noticed, in having outwardly more of the appearance of houses of wor-

ship, as distinguished from every other kind of building. This effect was produced especially by the solid construction of the towers, surmounted generally by spires, which though plain were far more significant and graceful than most of the cupolas (in charity they must be called) adorned with gingerbread joinery, which have risen in their places. But we may have more to say on this head; and we have not time now to linger any longer among these recollections of things that have scarcely left a sample in our land.

Since many congregations are, of late, showing some commendable ambition and liberality in repairing old edifices or erecting new ones, while yet, through want of judgment or care, they often fail to please judicious observers, and afterwards even themselves grow dissatisfied with their work; we have thought it might be needful and timely to turn the attention of our readers more particularly to this subject. Of course we write not for architects, nor for those traveled amateurs whose tastes are too foreign and expensive to be congenial with the tone of our institutions, or consistent with the resources of our people. We have, therefore, no desire, if we had the ability, to discourse learnedly and obscurely about the several Grecian orders, or the Gothic style, about entablatures, modules and soffits, or groins and mullions and crockets. We do not affect to be professionally acquainted with architecture, which is, of itself, a comprehensive art, with a large vocabulary of its own. But we would get the attention of those ministers and laymen who are commonly active in devising or adopting the plans, or furnishing the means for church building; and we would lay before them such hints as the great interest we feel in the subject, and the attention we have been able to bestow upon it, suggest for remedying prevailing errors and defects.

\* The term *slip*, applied to narrow pews, we believe is an Americanism.

<sup>t</sup> It should be carpeted to prevent noise, and defended by a close railing. It would make the gallery seem more properly a part of the house than now, and boys would take less liberty of tramping up and down. As a curious example of old things becoming new, we observed this arrangement in a costly modern edifice, the Duane street Presbyterian church in New York, and still more lately in the Swedenborgian chapel in Boston.

Our people have not yet come to appreciate the highest value of the arts as fully as some of the older European communities, and this is as true of architecture as of the other arts of design. In this department, many 'sensible good people' are more backward and deficient than in any other kind of improvement pertaining to high civilization. The building of a church is not sufficiently regarded as a work of art, as related to sublimity or beauty, and putting forth an influence by which those who are accustomed to see it or to worship in it are insensibly affected, not only in their taste but even in the tone of their religious sentiments. Some persons, we know, are always ready to put aside with contempt, all considerations of this kind connected with religion, as profane fancy or disguised worldliness. The laws of art and the suggestions or influences of association in cultivated minds, pass with such persons for 'mint and anise and cummin'—a sort of scriptural nickname, in their use, for things which they have failed to appreciate, yet are not at liberty to condemn. Be it so, that matters of taste are not among 'the weightier matters of the law,' yet the smallest things connected with religion ought not to be left uncared for, while the greatest are properly esteemed. Good morals will never flourish the more for the neglect of good manners. If the house of God is left without symmetry or fitness, his 'spiritual house' will not be the more perfect. The services of the sanctuary, we believe, will be the more acceptable to God, if the sanctuary itself is not suffered to be distasteful to man. Certainly the arts may be made in some way and in some degree, subservient to the doctrines and duties of Christianity. The sense of the beautiful, as a part of our nature, ought to be consulted, cultivated, and turned to the highest account, in the service of pure religion. And we can not think of any

instance in which such a connection is more obvious and direct than between architecture and worship. The demands of our nature we hold to be a sufficient argument on this point; but the coldest utilitarian can not deny that an imposing or attractive edifice creates in the minds of the worshipers associations favorable to the effect contemplated, and may alone often bring the undevout within the reach of the more powerful agencies that are at work within. Nor is this influence the less valuable because silent and gradual. If it can not be exactly computed, it is yet observed and felt. We would have good people give it a larger place in their estimates and arrangements. We would encourage and strengthen the alliance between true religion and refined taste, wherever it may be found, and especially between evangelical worship and instruction, and that department of art which lies nearest to them, or the best examples of those architectural forms which they must of necessity employ. And if there are those who will remain indifferent to the attractions of art and the affinities of religious sentiment, we would stimulate such persons on the score of sectarian emulation. Those denominations and those particular societies that are too niggardly or sluggish or prejudiced to make their houses of worship more agreeable or convenient, and will not keep pace with the public mind in this direction, but persist in defying or disregarding the laws of taste, will suffer as they ought to suffer by comparison with others. They will fail to gain adherents, they will lose some they now have, among those whom they would most wish to secure, the youthful part of the community, who inevitably prefer for their innocent satisfaction, if not for their religious edification also, those sanctuaries where they find not only the essentials but the natural aids and embellishments of devotion. This consid-

eration operates in some instances where every other fails.

Again: we are disposed to encourage rather than to check or disown the liberal expenditure in church building, of which many congregations have, within a few years, given conspicuous examples. Some fears have been expressed on this subject, and occasionally a note of alarm is sounded in the papers, as if the religious community were in danger of ecclesiastical prodigality and bankruptcy. We are acquainted with the facts alledged, yet feel no new concern of this sort. The people of the United States are more in danger of making money too fast than of squandering too much, and they are in danger of wasting it in every other way rather than in church building. It is worthy of observation too, that in the city of New York the most costly enterprises of this kind have sprung up in rapid succession within the last ten or twelve years, the series taking date from the disastrous times of 1835, 6, when fashionable extravagance and overwrought speculation were prostrated, and business itself arrested, for a season; so that the liberality of the wealthy seems to have received a new impulse, and to have been partially diverted by unexpected methods into at least one safe and useful channel, that was before neglected. The objection, that costly churches are not strictly necessary to religious purposes, we can not allow to be of any moment, for reasons implied in what we have said before. It is always sufficiently answered by pointing to Solomon's temple, with all its divinely ordained splendors, and to the 'pound of ointment,' 'very costly,' with which Mary anointed the Savior's feet and won his approbation. The most plausible form of the objection is, that the sums lavished in this way might be expended in charity to the poor and to the heathen. But Judas put such reasoning into

bad odor when he said, 'Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?' 'This he said not because he cared for the poor, but because he had the bag and bare what was put therein.' A similar explanation may be now often given of the same pretense, and we believe the incident was recorded in order that it might be thus applied. Whenever it seems to come from a more respectable source, we reckon it a short-sighted mistake. We reply briefly, the sums expended on churches would not be given to the heathen nor to the poor if the churches were not built. They come chiefly from the rich or the prosperous, who generally, if rightly disposed, will not deduct them from their own benefactions, and if not thus disposed, would not, in any case, add them to the resources of Christian benevolence. Besides, the comfort and beauty of the house of God have claims on the liberality of his worshipers, as well as the extension of his kingdom among the heathen. Of course we acknowledge the limits of justice and discretion in this as in every other kind of expenditure. Societies have no more right than individuals to incur debts of which they see no way of ridding themselves honorably, and careful management in this particular is, no doubt, one of their most sacred obligations. They are bound to graduate their expenses according to their resources. But these limits of discretion and justice can not be the same in all congregations, nor can they be defined except in this general manner. We see no more reason to fear that they will be transcended in the building of churches, than in the building of private houses, or in any of the arts or of the enterprises in which liberality may possibly run to excess. It is conceivable that the wealthiest congregation might expend too much even in proportion to their means upon

their house of worship, but such a case is of too rare occurrence to be taken into the account.\* We admit also that vanity and the love of display and unhallowed emulation do in fact enter more or less into the motives that actuate congregations in their most liberal expenditures of this kind. But the same thing may be said of their munificence and activity in other forms. If men are compassing a proper end, we would urge them to attempt it in the right spirit and by the right methods, but we would not stop their zealous work because we detect too much alloy in their tools or in themselves. In fine, instead of taking alarm at the large sums of late years lavished in church building in the city of New York, by opulent congregations vieing with one another, we would rather stimulate other cities, and the wealthy parishes in our country generally, to similar enterprises. We can not fear that such enthusiasm will spread too far or burn too deep. We would like to see public spirit, even if it be nothing more, in this and in other forms getting possession of our church-going capitalists and men of business. And even when the rich are profuse in building temples worthy of the Most High for no better reason than to increase the value of their property in the neighborhood, or from the frivolous love of ostentation, it is only one of many instances in which He makes the selfishness and folly, as well as 'the wrath' of man to 'praise' him.

We call the attention of our readers however, to the difference between costliness and good taste in ecclesiastical architecture. Comparatively few congregations can afford large sums in constructing or improving their houses of worship, and those that have the largest resources are not always the readiest to use them. Our churches must therefore, with few exceptions, be cheap structures. Such must of necessity be the architecture of our country, at least for many years to come. Hence the difference we have named is exceedingly important, and ought to be generally understood. Costliness and good taste are easily distinguished in dress and equipage. The greater the expense, if it be not well bestowed, the worse is the effect. So among private houses, a cottage costing a thousand dollars may please every refined observer more than a mansion that consumed a fortune; one man's barn may strike a discerning eye more than his neighbor's dwelling. Thus too such a church as can be built by the poorest people who can support a minister, may be more satisfactory to an architect or to any person conversant with good models, than some pagoda or other splendid toy which their rich neighbors may task themselves in erecting for the same purpose. The chief question should be, not how much money can be raised, but how can it be used on a house of God with the utmost advantage for these three things—not one of them alone, but all combined—economy, convenience, and beauty. We believe it will be found that this last is not so expensive an article as is generally supposed. Horace Walpole has a remark to this effect, that if a man would make way with a fortune, he need only 'have a taste,' but it is not true, unless by taste he means only a whimsical capricious fancy. The sense of the beautiful may tempt an individual or a people to extra-

\* We have not fallen on an instance of the kind. Trinity church in New York is not an exception. There has been some croaking about it, but really we know of no way in which that plethoric moneyed corporation *could* and *would* relieve itself more creditably than by building incomparably the finest church in our country. If to adorn that city, to regale the eyes of the multitudes of strangers there, and to associate the worship of God with the impressiveness of architectural design,—if all this be worth doing, they ought to be commended, not reproached.

gance, but it may be indulged also, and commonly must be if at all, in a plain unexceptionable way. We might confirm our remarks by the testimony of judicious travelers in Europe, and especially in England, who are struck with the picturesque effect of many of the humbler old parish churches, scarcely less than with the magnificence of the most noted cathedrals. Some of our leading architects have of late turned their attention especially to this point, and employed their skill in devising unexpensive plans which our poorer parishes may adopt, and by which we hope our towns and villages will yet be adorned as they have not been before. Let our building committees remember that so far as permanent effect is concerned, the effect of acknowledged beauty, every thing depends on just designs rather than abundant means, and that they may make their new church handsomer than the old one or than most of the surrounding churches, for nothing but the pains, and often at half the cost.

It is worthy of consideration that ordinary congregations might in the end build better churches, without tasking their resources too far or incurring too heavy liabilities, if they would take more time for it. The people of this country are too much in the habit of doing a thing at once, whether well or ill, instead of expending their strength, as it accumulates from time to time, on the successive parts of an undertaking, so as to produce in the result a more perfect whole. Congregations seem not to have learned that it is possible, with their present means, to build so much of a church as will accommodate the assembly for a time, and then after a few years, with recruited means, to complete the edifice more satisfactorily than they could have done it immediately. One set of subscribers at once take the work upon their shoulders, instead of reasonably devolving a part

of the burden upon other times and persons. Hence they exhaust their resources for a result at best imperfect. For example, if a large church is to be built of stone, and only thirty thousand dollars can be raised, the steeple is made of wood, and when once erected is never replaced by any thing better; whereas if that sum were now expended on the body of the building, in a few years the same people will have the inducement and the ability to complete it in stone, and then the whole work, from the corner-stone to the steeple-top, will be satisfactory and enduring. It was only in this latter way that the most famous churches in Europe were erected, or could have been erected. Some of them are the work of successive generations, and even of successive ages. And among ourselves a house of worship, like the spiritual house within, will often be more perfect in the end if we give it time for growth.\*

We must take this opportunity to protest against the ambitious and pretending, yet abortive style adopted in some of the new churches. We are not referring to the costly buildings erected within a few years past after European models, most of which fare hard at the hands of traveled critics, who having seen the originals decry the imitations, more however as if vaunting their superior observation than for the sake of encouraging enthusiasm in the art. Ambitious congregations, composed of a certain class in our cities, are in danger of aping foreign models beyond their reach, in church building as in their style of living; yet let them have credit for structures that look well notwithstanding the affectation. But we have now in our eye churches that on the face of them betray the disposition of their builders to attempt

\* The finest church in Connecticut is an example, having been built of stone to the belfry, and some years afterwards completed of the same material.

more than they could accomplish, and to make a show either beyond their means or beyond what the occasion warrants. We hold it as unbecoming in churches as in individuals, when they seem intended to pass for more than they are worth. The mixture of costly and cheap materials, palpable imitation, incongruity, incompleteness, these things and the like offend cultivated taste as savoring of pretense, as the fruit of abortive ambition. When we see a stone front and brick sides, the next thought is, these people were too poor or else too niggardly to build of stone, yet to build of brick they were ashamed. A frame-building covered with planks looks better than such a mixture.\* When the windows have pointed arches, but the ceiling is flat or an unbroken curve, and the columns are Grecian or American, the whole is a mongrel product, to be admired only as it is wondered at. When an open chapel, or a receding colonnade, is painted on the wall behind the pulpit, it seems as if the people had only aimed to do 'some great thing' for the sake of doing it. The thing represented to the eye would be out of place if it were real, and we take it to be a sound rule that art should not attempt to impose upon us with an imitation, where the original would not be wanted if it could be had. When the interior wood-work, in the pulpit, pews and galleries, looks considerably like marble, or mahogany, or oak, or black walnut, yet we know it is all painted pine, we ask, Why not expend more (yet not a great deal more, in the long run, considering the cost of paint) in getting the more beautiful and enduring mate-

rials themselves, or if they can not be afforded, why put on an appearance which every body sees through? In this particular the oldest churches that we can remember looked better than their more ambitious successors. The pews were of pine, 'clear stuff' carefully selected, not disguised with paint, but getting a darker, richer hue with time; and this common material, if only oiled and varnished so as to show the texture and veins, is really more beautiful, as well as cheaper, than with the 'oaking' now in vogue, besides being a reality and not a 'sham.' Many persons would be surprised to observe the agreeable and varied hues of pine, white-wood, bass-wood, and other trees common in different parts of our country, when properly wrought and prepared. Yet so little has this fact been understood, that cherry, which is a richer wood than either of those we have named, used to be stained to make it look like a coarse kind of mahogany. The native wood moreover improves with age, while the faded imitations have to be renewed. For ourselves, if we could not afford to have pews made of black walnut or oak, we would not have them pretend to be richer than they are. Imitative painting, even in the higher range of decoration, is at best a superficial temporary beauty in architecture. In ordinary churches every thing that is merely ornamental should be carefully kept subordinate to the general effect intended. The obtrusive appearance of art savors of ostentation, and is therefore offensive. And we may say in general, that when any thing beyond a plain style in church building is attempted, the work must be in judicious hands, or it will betray at one point or another more of ambition than of good taste, more of pretension than of achievement. We have named a few of the most prominent instances that have fallen under our observation, and though

\* A church ceiled with planks grooved together perpendicularly, not even planed, but only painted to resemble dark stone, may be made much more pleasing than most of our rural churches, and is said to endure well. We have heard of one on Greenfield hill.

others might be noted, we hope these will suffice for a timely caution to some of the multitude who need it.

We would have it borne in mind among all persons concerned in church building, that architecture since it came to be more than a mere contrivance for sheltering us from the weather, is properly an *art*, one of the fine arts, and not a creature of *fashion*. Like painting and sculpture it has its own paramount models, ideas and laws, which originated in the sense of beauty, and are recognized accordingly wherever this part of our nature is developed and cultivated. It is one province in the realm of that faculty which goes under the name of taste. *Fashion*, on the contrary, is—what we have scarcely any other name for—the product of a capricious fancy, springing from the whims of individuals, depending on novelty for effect, prevailing at certain times and places like contagion or infection, and from its nature ever fluctuating, having no principle but that of change. It has to do with the shape of a bonnet or the cut of a coat; but the proportions of an edifice are properly above its range. The common misapplication of the word shows a popular misconception on this subject. A church is said to be 'in the fashion' or 'old fashioned,' like an old or new importation of millinery, without reference to any other standard of judgment than the custom of the place and time, as if there were no other more comprehensive and enduring.\* What would be thought if a picture or

a statue were spoken of in the same manner? Yet architectural design may not less fairly claim exemption from the authority of fashion. Whenever such language can be fitly applied to works of taste, it is because art has in those instances sunk itself to a compliance with the caprice of individuals or the whims of a season. Thus painting sometimes degenerates till the style is excessively artificial, and of necessity must soon cease to please; in which case the fault of the style is that it has become a fashion at all, and whether it be old or new is a question of little consequence. Thus too in architecture we complain not so much of the word *fashion*, as of the thing itself, and the extent to which it is allowed to affect the popular judgment and feeling. The style of our churches ought never to have been what is called 'a fashion' at all; but having been such originally, it has necessarily become an old fashion. To replace it now by a new fashion, is only to renew the difficulty sooner or later, and this is the very mistake many congregations are in turn running into, instead of resorting to the true methods of ecclesiastical architecture. A church is to be built: it must be like any other rather than the old one, so as to have the charm of novelty; a committee is appointed; they look at other churches in the neighborhood, marking the 'newest patterns,' for the 'latest improvements'—therein often reversing their theological tendencies; they take their idea of the size and shape of the house from one place, of the steeple from another, of the pulpit from a third, and of the pews from a fourth; and these cold fragments they weld together as they can, in a new plan of their own. But this is not the worst: the members of the committee have also their several notions on the occasion, æsthetical, economical, or nameless, and by the help of mutual concession (to change our figure) they graft these whims

\* Carpenters do injustice to their business by confining themselves unnecessarily to such notions of their ornamental work. We knew of a church built in the plainest style, from which all mouldings were purposely excluded, but it was as much as the overseer could do to keep them off from the window-frames, because the workmen said they were 'the fashion.'

of their own on a stock already sufficiently unnatural; and the result is—what might be expected. We are not sure that even this picture is overcharged. Our readers can recall instances of some peculiarity in the structure or arrangement of churches, originating in the ignorance or conceit of individuals, and copied, as improvements upon long established models, in one case after another till they 'had their run' and went out of date. We have heard of a people who had a stone quarry in the midst of them and made a business of exporting that material, yet had such a stubborn predilection for red brick that they built a new church of it without the plea of economy. There was a time long ago when many of our old parish churches were adorned with three tiers of small windows. All our old churches, so far as we are informed, had the pulpit on one side, instead of at the end, as if to enable the people to outflank the minister, or to put them out of the point-blank range of the sermon. In truth it was a well meant, though ill judged contrivance in aid of the hearing, when no aid was needed, and showed the audience to one another better than to the speaker. For a similar reason many churches are made nearly as broad as they are long, or exactly square in the interior; whereas none of them are so large as to require such proportions for the ease of the speaker or the hearers; and an oblong figure in a building or a room is more agreeable to the eye than a square. Then instead of the tower and spire which were the best part of an old New England meeting-house, it became 'the fashion' to put a portico or colonnade in front, and perch a low square belfrey above it, like a martin-box on gate-posts, as may often be seen at this day. Another innovation was the putting the pulpit between two front doors of the church; an arrangement at one time 'fashionable' in a line of

churches through the country,\* and still suffered to stand in most of them, but not likely to be renewed. The only show of reason for it, that we have discovered, is that a stranger entering the church may be known as such, and may sooner receive the hospitality of a seat; but a modest stranger, if he can not be accommodated by the sexton, would rather at any time take his chance of being recognized sideways than confront all the people. It has been alledged too, that in such a church the people will not look behind them to see others entering or leaving; but it happens that while one hearer would turn his head to a door opening in the rear, twenty will turn their eyes to the same interruption before them, and every speaker knows that their heads may as well be turned round as their eyes turned off. On the other hand there is the inconvenience of making the poorer classes of persons march to the further seats in the face of the congregation, and of often virtually excluding stragglers and such as happen to be late, who will stay out rather than be stared at for going in. The arrangement has been properly complained of also as unsuitable to a house of worship, because in all sacred edifices, ancient and modern, it has been customary to have the rites performed at the end remote from the principal entrance; this uniformity of usage indicating reasons of reverence and impressiveness from which it naturally grew up. We hope many of our respectable congregations will mend their ways in this particular, as some have already. Many congregations are growing wiser too in another particular—abandoning the custom of having lecture-rooms under churches; a fashion only not so bad as putting shops in the same position,

\* The example we have been told was first set in Dr. Mason's church, in Murray street, New York.

which can be excused only on the plea of extreme poverty. At first such rooms were half under ground, really cellars, low, close and damp, as if to generate bad air and *bronchitis*; and then this evil was supplanted by another, when the first story above ground was given up to the lecture-room, and the church itself was virtually put up stairs. The latter method allows of more height in the room, yet not two thirds of what is needed; but it detracts more than almost any other arrangement from the convenience and beauty of the church itself. Happily most of our older edifices were built as they ought to have been, on foundations too low to admit of any consecrated caverns beneath, and yet here and there congregations have been indiscreet enough to spoil the old arrangement, by laying an upper floor for the church, and reserving the old one for the lecture-room. The truth is, a lecture-room or chapel has no proper place except over the vestibule, or behind the church, or else detached from it, and every foot that the floor of a church is raised above what is required to avoid dampness, is an inconvenience and a blemish. Another later 'fashion,' dispenses with what is called the center aisle between the pews, even in wide churches, for no reason that we have heard except that the space immediately before the preacher may all be filled with the audience. Such a reason seems too trivial, for we never knew a speaker annoyed by that vacant stripe of plank or carpet. The center aisle is convenient on various public occasions, especially where processions are required, and we submit it to any unprejudiced judge whether it is not agreeable to the eye as the principal passage through the edifice, giving direct access from the chief entrance to the best seats and to the desk. The innovation has impaired the effect of some of our churches,

but it can not prevail generally or long. We might cite other examples, and particularly one we have already noticed—the rage for painting one kind of wood in imitation of another, or 'graining,' as it is called, and for particular colors also, as for instance green on the inside of the pews, and a glaring white every where else. But we have named cases enough to show our meaning. These notions, and the like, are in architecture, what the whims of ignorant and conceited zealots are in theology, the antics of private judgment. They can not bear the test of time, and this of itself is a critical difference between the works of fashion and those of true art. Their inventors grow weary of their own fancies, and new follies displace the old. By one ill advised experiment a congregation entails upon itself the necessity of another.

In distinction from the fashions of times and places, architecture, as we have said, has its own permanent models, ideas, and laws, which are both permanent and just because conformed to the only true standard of beauty, the cultivated judgment of mankind at large, and the more approved by time and trial. None will deny that there is such a thing as beauty in architecture, and that something of the kind may be reasonably expected in the house of God when we once go beyond the limits of bare necessity in the arrangement of such a building. Yet we have heard men on entering a new church pronounce it 'very neat,' as if this were to exhaust the subject, though they might say as much of a new barn. If they are discerning persons, it is an equivocal compliment, like saying that a minister appears to be a good man, to avoid saying he is a poor preacher. The effect of beauty is something more positive and 'pleasurable.' While this is admitted, some still question the existence of any proper stand-

ard, setting aside criticism with such sayings, as 'every one to his taste,' and 'de gustibus,' &c. In their notion of taste they confound the whim of a single mind with the concurring judgments of many, or the sentiment that prevails for a time in a limited circle, with the pervading growing sentiment of civilized man. But let any person of tolerable cultivation look upon the Parthenon, or St. Peter's church in Rome, or York Minster, and then consider how remote from such things are transient individual caprices, how foreign and inferior seems the popular idea of fashion. In these and other like examples, mankind are sufficiently agreed to prove a common standard by which their individual judgments must in the main be ultimately determined. There are orders and styles in architecture, as there are schools in painting, but these very differences are in harmony though not in unison. They are so many recognitions of manifest beauty, as true Christians of various sects agree in manifold goodness, having 'diversities of gifts' and 'of operations' but 'the same Spirit.' The structures that have been so tried and approved, embody the various just ideas of architecture, as the lives of certain saints do those of practical Christianity, and such ideas are further developed in living minds by congenial contemplation. The laws of taste in this department become incorporated as it were with our own perceptions, and hence are more clearly recognized and more easily applied. Thus improvements are to be effected, not by blindly following the usage with which we happen to be most acquainted, nor by running after novelty, but by recurrence to what may be called principles. A new plan ought to be devised without taking 'fashion' into the account, and to be neither approved nor rejected upon mere reference to recent usages. We

have not room, even if we had the ability, here to set forth these principles as they might be with advantage. One thing that ought always to be considered, is that a church as a whole should have one harmonious effect. The several parts may be in keeping so as to produce a general expression; as such expression is necessary to the varieties of personal beauty, yet results not from single features but from all the elements that in their natural combination make the face and form one whole. The beauty of the 'spiritual house' is not merely the aggregate of the virtues of all its 'lively stones,' but a new product of their mutual relation and adjustment. The beauty of a building lies not chiefly in the several parts, but in their harmony, or their subordination to one pervading effect; in that expressiveness which the mind recognizes in the suitable disposition even of things that are not themselves beautiful. Many a church has been spoiled by some one glaring incongruity, while another pleases for this reason, if no other can be found, that it is in keeping with itself throughout. This consideration is particularly important in the remodeling of old churches that have an architectural character already. The confusion of the several orders and styles impairs the effect, because each has a character of its own, whether of simplicity, grace, massiveness, or grandeur, and is capable of some corresponding expression; and the careless distribution of colors also mars designs otherwise the most agreeable. Another just rule is that the architecture of a church should be such as to distinguish it from other public buildings. The Quakers, and portions of some other sects, have made a point of disregarding this distinction as far as possible, but their notion savors of whim or prejudice. There is no good reason why an edifice should

not appear to be what it is in fact. A church is devoted to a peculiar use, and therefore it should have a peculiar aspect. It ought to designate itself to the eye. Even common observers are not satisfied with a building which for aught that appears may be a house of worship or a school house, a temple of religion or a temple of justice, a sanctuary or a town hall. A well constructed steeple—at least something more than the belfry of an academy or a factory—will save the question, ‘what kind of a building is that?’ Another remark akin to this, seems obvious enough, yet is often overlooked: that good taste as well as comfort requires a house of worship, especially the interior, to be suitable to the use for which it is designed. As we have said before, every building should have a character of its own. That of a church should be, not only distinct, but favorable and appropriate to worship. Every part should be in keeping not only with the other parts, but with the use to be made of the whole. Beauty is not entirely independent of convenience here. The worship of God is something to be understood, and therefore it should be heard, and the preacher should be both heard and seen. Hence the huge columns, or rather pillars and groups of pillars, in some of the ancient churches abroad, are unsuitable, except in those buildings where there is room ‘enough and to spare.’ In our churches they would be ‘in the way.’ And apart from convenience, the appearance of every thing in such a place ought to be congenial with devotion. Many brick churches present a show of red and white on the outside, which is decidedly more military than ecclesiastical. Within, obviously the outlines and colors should be such as to compose, not to distract or divert attention; chaste rather than striking. Brilliance and show are foreign to the

scene.\* Every thing in the nature of decoration must seem to be subservient to the spirit of the place, or it is a blemish. A subdued light is felt to be favorable to the solemnity of religious services, and painted walls and stained windows add to the effect; as Milton speaks of—

—‘storied windows richly dight,  
Casting a dim religious light.’

Formerly our churches let in all the light that could be had, and the walls were scrupulously whitewashed, as if colors were profane, or could be of no use except to weak eyes. Since attention has been turned to the subject, there is some danger of running into the opposite extreme of gairish or fantastic tints.† Coloring in churches as well as other parts of design, must be regulated by the standard we have pointed out, and not by the fashions of the day; otherwise it should be abandoned, or made a department of millinery.

Another principle in the architecture of churches, as of other buildings, is the connection between utility and beauty. We would not have the two things confounded, but certainly the one is often closely related to the other. The appearance of convenience or strength, where these qualities are wanted, is one element of beauty. A col-

\* We remember a costly church where the space about the pulpit was so splendidly carpeted that looking down upon it from the gallery, we could think of it only as a gay parlor or brilliant saloon. Another that we saw in Philadelphia made so much show of bronze and gilt about the desk, that we could not but ask, what would Paul say to that?

† Some wag said of the new Grace church in New York, that the Pearl street merchants of that congregation, had put patterns of their chintzes into the windows. The stained glass there is more brilliant than we have seen in any other church, but after all that has been said, we were agreeably disappointed in the blending and harmony of the colors.

umn that seems to support nothing is offensive to good taste; and so is the want of it wherever it seems to be required. To conceal the chimneys of a dwelling-house because the Greek temples had none, is a mistake; for chimneys are known to be needful in a residence, though not in those temples, and therefore the appearance of them is appropriate, and their concealment is an imperfection suggesting the notion of discomfort. Thus too the appearance of weakness, even where there is strength, is unsatisfactory. Slender rods, if made of iron, may support a gallery, but they are less agreeable to the eye than columns that not only are in fact sufficient, but appear to be so. For the same reason it is a fault, as we have before remarked, when the steeple of a church seems to rest on the roof instead of rising as a solid tower from the ground. The roof may possibly be strong enough to bear it, or it may really stand on its own tower or frame of timbers within the front wall, but there is not the appearance of strength—there is no solidity to the eye—and this is itself a defect.\* Certain modes of building improve to the eye upon acquaintance with them, because they are found to be stronger and more enduring than others. Cruciform churches have an advantage of this kind, besides their association with the Christian symbol; for walls so arranged, though necessarily more expensive because much longer than when enclosing the same space in the form of a square, have a narrower roof to support, and are less in danger of spreading. With, or without this form, if a church is very large, the roof may be in fact divided along its whole length, and its weight of course distributed, by

raising the central portion, or the nave, higher than the rest in what is called a 'clere story,' resting on arches and pillars, while the lower lateral partitions or aisles at once strengthen it and support their parts of the incumbent weight.† The difficulty of supporting heavy roofs for a great length of time, is a reason for either adopting this last method, or for strengthening them by columns or pillars rising to the ceiling of the interior, taking care that these be not unnecessarily large. And for the same reason the area, especially of our larger edifices, should be oblong rather than square. In these instances we refer not only to real solidity as of course desirable in construction, but to the appearance of it as entering into beauty of design. We advert to one more point which ought to be regarded in ecclesiastical architecture: the suitableness of a church to its peculiar position. The style of the building ought to be adapted to its site and circumstances. St. Peter's might have been built where it would only seem to fill a hole, and the Parthenon might stand where every thing around would overshadow it.‡ What is called 'a fine house' in a city, imitated in the country looks stiff and bare. A rural church may have favorable accompaniments for which wealth can find no substitute in crowded streets. Amidst the

\* A German looking at one of the many steeples constructed in this manner in our country, complained, that 'it had no generation.'

† These two methods combined, as they are in many of the noted cathedrals abroad, may be seen on a comparatively small scale in Grace church in New York. Trinity church is the best example in this country, of the latter method alone. A small cruciform church, worth looking at, on the corner of 6th avenue and 20th street, New York, is said to have been copied entirely from an old English parish church. If Puseyism did nothing worse than such things, we would not complain of it.

‡ Any one may observe how the effect of St. Paul's church in Boston is well nigh destroyed by the vicinity of the Masonic Temple, which however was built subsequently.

works of nature, simplicity is felt to be an indispensable beauty in a work of art. Good architecture is itself more pleasing in the country than in towns, and as churches are there the most conspicuous works of art, we have often felt how much effect they might be made to produce, and yet what deficiency and neglect they show. And particularly we have regretted that for some slight consideration of economy, the spire that may be made to every eye attractive and significant, shooting upward gracefully from the foliage of the country, has so generally given place to an unsightly cupola or belfry. A well constructed square tower, crowned with battlements and turrets, has a massive aspect appropriate to a large edifice, especially when surmounting an eminence ; but such a belfry as we often see is nothing better than an incumbrance to the roof. And the spire, as a graceful and lively object, is better suited to most rural situations, than the heavier kind of steeples. Our churches moreover, are generally too small to allow of the majestic effect of such towers as are to be found abroad. The color too of a building should often be determined partly by its situation, which brings it into comparison or contrast with other colors in nature or art. When entirely exposed, the more glaring hues become the more offensive.

Most of our churches have been painted white on the exterior, because such was supposed to be the fashion, without even the plea of economy. When they stand in valleys, approached from surrounding hills, white spires rising among trees and defined against the green foliage, are agreeable objects to every eye. On a plain however, or as seen in a city, a dark spire has its outline drawn against the sky more clearly, and hence appears to greater advantage even at a distance. Whenever stone can

be used instead of wood or brick, its own color is to be preferred, though it may not be such as would be selected for artificial imitation, and if the spire must be of wood, (though we would have it left incomplete till it can be afterwards finished with stone,) it should be so colored as to resemble the rest of the building. In certain situations it has a good effect to place the tower or steeple at an angle of the building, after the example of some of the old churches abroad, though as yet it strikes our people oddly ; as when it stands on the corner of a city street, which thus seems to be fully occupied and strengthened, or on the brow of a hill where it looks off boldly from a point more sightly than the main entrance. Amidst mountainous or wild scenery, architecture is required to be bolder and more diversified, than in a tamer champaign region. As far as possible, art must ally itself with nature in building, as well as in laying out grounds, in order to secure the best effect. But so many circumstances may be taken into account in adapting the style of an edifice to its situation, that we can here only turn the attention of our readers to the topic. And indeed this is all we have hoped to do in the examples we have given, of what may be called principles in church building.\*

\* We append here (for want of a better place) two suggestions which will be found to favor simplicity, and also economy, at least of room. In any except the largest churches, there is no need of any other vestibule or inner porch, than the interior of the tower, into which the chief door opens. The two side-doors should lead directly into the audience-room, (the staircases being also within,) and these being necessarily thrown open when the congregation disperse, will ensure some ventilation of the house, while in winter only the middle door need be opened for the gathering of the assembly. The effect to the eye will be the better, if the tower just joins the building instead of standing half within it. The other suggestion relates to the length of pews,

But it may naturally be asked, 'What should a congregation do then, amidst all the diversities of private judgment, the points to be considered, and the errors to be shunned? Who but a professional artist is sufficient for these things?' A proper question certainly; and in answering it for themselves, judicious people will generally go to an architect—just where we would have them go. And by an architect we mean of course, not a mere builder, nor every ingenious mechanick who being a good draughtsman makes a business of furnishing designs; but one who, with good sense and professional enthusiasm, loves and pursues architecture not only as his means of subsistence, but as an art, acquainting himself with its models and principles, and aiming to improve rather than to follow the 'fashions of the day.' Such men are not to be found every where, but they are increasing in number and merit with the general growth of our country. Like other real artists, they must be paid for their ser-

vices; but congregations will find it even cheaper in the end, as well as better, to employ a man of this stamp, than to pay less to an inferior builder or an amateur, because their designs will bear the test of time without requiring costly changes. But as it avails little to employ a physician and then follow one's own judgment instead of his prescriptions, so it is a common difficulty in church building that committee men take liberties with the architect and modify his design according to their several partialities and whims, till it ceases to be his, and indeed has no unity of purpose or effect. For example, he gives them a front elevation after one of the Grecian orders, and then for the sake of getting a bad lecture-room beneath, they mount it upon a basement story which has no affinity for any order. They would lower the steeple, and therefore they shorten the spire instead of reducing the whole. One would have more columns of smaller size, another would put them further apart.\*. The roof must be made steep enough to spoil the pediment, or the portico must be enclosed at the ends, or instead of one large door there must be three small ones, or the whole house must be as broad as it is long. Whatever be the style adopted, the best design is thus liable to be marred in numberless ways, and every architect will probably reckon such interferences among the most vexatious trials of his calling. Let his em-

whether in a large or small edifice. They should be made to hold four adults, instead of six or seven as now; so as to give a small family a separate pew if they choose it, instead of obliging them to club together or be under tenants in a long pew, while a large or wealthy family, by taking two in a line opening into two aisles, could be also better accommodated than now. Thus a house 52 feet in breadth, having six ranges of pews, each 64 feet long, and three aisles occupying the other 13 feet, will be found more convenient than if the same breadth is divided into four ranges of pews, each 10 $\frac{1}{2}$  feet long, and two aisles. So wider churches may have eight ranges of short pews, instead of six ranges of longer ones as now, preserving the center aisle, and having half aisles along the walls. Besides better accomodating families, such an arrangement would be more convenient for occasional purposes, as the house would be more fully occupied by a large assembly, and could be sooner emptied. By a little care, the aisles too may be made as available for seating a crowded audience as any part of the house. Will not some building committees consider the matter?

\* Somebody, more curious than critical, once complained that the columns of the State House in New Haven diminished in size toward the top. A wag answered him, properly enough according to the scriptural rule for answering some people, that the intervals might be made equal by inverting every other column. We have heard of a case in which an architect of great merit designed a shingled wooden spire (on a stone church) to be left unpainted till the weather should turn it brown, but one of the committee dipped the shingles in oil to preserve them, and so preserved the hue of pine just planed.

ployers take it for granted that his judgment in matters of this kind is better than their own. 'Every man to his business.' His eye is on the whole subject, their eyes on a part of it; and as long as they hold the purse, let them leave the pencil to him.

Another caution we believe to be needful not only for the people at large, but sometimes for architects who deservedly stand high in their profession. For ourselves we would maintain a certain catholic liberality of sentiment on this subject, as in every other department of art, in opposition to that idolatrous or bigoted adherence to one of all the approved standards, which excludes just appreciation and genial sympathy for any other. Among the several styles of architecture which have stood the test of time and survived the caprices of fashion, and of which we have examples in world-renowned churches, individual minds will of necessity have their own preferences, and architects themselves can not be expected to agree in the enthusiastic admiration of one, nor to regard all with impartial complacency. What we call the public mind is never equipoised, and does not always remain the same, or expend its enthusiasm in the same direction: it leans this way or that, and shows now one inclination, then another. This preference predominating for a time, perhaps for centuries, yet destined to change, differs from the popular idea of fashion, though sometimes confounded with it; as being more comprehensive and enduring, or having a larger sweep, and obeying higher laws. It is the taste or the prevailing tendency, not of one province or one season, but of a nation or of an age, of ancient Greece or Rome, of Northern or Southern Europe, of the middle ages or of later centuries. Upon what is called the revival of learning in Europe, after the mixed Roman models had long

prevailed in the more southern countries, and the most eminent examples of Norman and Gothic architecture had already grown venerable in England and Germany, the public taste in England as well as elsewhere turned strongly toward the purer Greek forms, which in turn became objects of too exclusive admiration. More or less modified they entered into the ideal of artists and amateurs, to the undue disparagement of all later models. The Gothic style began to be reckoned fantastic and well nigh barbarous, like the superstitions of the ages that produced its most wonderful examples, in comparison with the Greek orders and their Roman derivatives. Sir Christopher Wren may be regarded as an example of this tendency. Within the present century, a change in this respect has been going on in Great Britain and in this country. In architecture, as in poetry, the classic and romantic tendencies seem to have been in competition, the one or the other prevailing in both arts at nearly the same periods; and of late the latter seems to have been regaining in turn its old ascendancy. Pointed arches and clustered pillars now attract the enthusiasm of church builders, more than nicely adjusted columns and entablatures. And human nature still carries its partialities into extremes, for in some parts of this country we see barns and sheds made to look like Gothic chapels or monastic enclosures, as formerly in England, they aspired to resemble Greek temples. Now the caution we believe to be needful is against exclusiveness in this or in any other direction, and in behalf of that more liberal habit which recognizes beauty under all its variety of forms and expressions. Judging from the notices and comments in some of the popular journals and in fashionable conversation, and from the zeal with which one congregation emulates another in copying

same class of models, one might suppose that really no costly church ought to be built, or can ever again be admired, unless it is made to look like some old English example; and that the imitation is only the more to be admired if the original was constructed piecemeal at successive times, and hence had a propriety which in truth never can be transferred to any copy. We need not say that we have no disrelish and no prejudice of any sort against Gothic architecture; we claim to enjoy the best specimens we have seen of it as highly as any of those who admire nothing else: but we will not confine our complacency to this as the only true ecclesiastical style, any more than we would shut up our sympathies within any one communion as the only true 'spiritual house.' Some persons have fallen into a way of speaking about it, from which one would suppose it had been prescribed or at least commended some where in the writings of the primitive fathers, if not in the New Testament. It is sometimes called (not by scientific architects, yet by those who ought to know better) ecclesiastical and even Christian architecture, as if no other style had been appropriated, or reckoned suitable by the world at large, for ecclesiastical or christian use. Such phraseology is certainly sectarian or at best national, rather than catholic. The Gothic is not, and never has been, the prevailing style of architecture in Christendom at large. It belongs mainly to England and parts of France and Germany. Even within those limits, some of the most noted churches, as for example St. Paul's cathedral, are not Gothic but rather Greek or Roman structures variously modified,\* and parts of old English ca-

thedrals called Gothic are rather Norman, distinguished, in common with what is called on the continent the Byzantine or Romanesque style,† by the prevalence of the semicircular instead of the pointed arch. As to the rest of the nominally Christian world, it is said there is not a Gothic church in Rome, and not many in all Italy. With all their culture in the arts, the people of that country are said to disparage this sort of architecture as savoring of barbarism. And beyond the 'temporal estates' of the Pope, the church of Rome—that 'holy mother' or 'erring sister,' as the Oxford clique call her according to the end they have to answer—shows no distinguishing favor towards this style. St. Peter's is her boast and model, which is as unlike York Minster as one stupendous structure can be unlike another erected originally by the same church for the same purposes. Then if we go back into antiquity, Gothic architecture where it has flourished most, is not half as old as Christianity. As one writer observes, the first hymn arose from a Christian assembly not under pointed arches, but, as soon as buildings could be erected for the purpose, in structures copied, like some now seen in Rome, mainly from the ancient Roman basilica. The ante-Nicene church, so much lauded in some quarters for its catholic purity, knew nothing of the architecture which in the same quarters is extolled as the ecclesiastical. But this style is said to have had its birth under Christianity, and hence from it,

as of the Puritan sort, unfortunately not suspecting that he was thus disparaging a well known church in London, 'St. Martin's in the Fields,' from which the Center church was taken by Mr. Town.

† The 'church of the Puritans,' (Dr. Cheever's,) in the city of New York, is said to be in the Romanesque style. That style, and what is properly called in England the Norman, are sufficiently distinct from the Gothic, yet equally removed from any Greek order.

\* Within a year or two a writer in Blackwood's Magazine, giving an account of his visit to New Haven some years ago, sneers at the architecture of the Congregational churches on the public square,

and to be congenial with the main ideas of the Christian system, so as to be itself properly called Christian. So far as time is concerned, the same distinction belongs to all the inventions and discoveries made in Christian countries—the press, the steam-engine and gunpowder. The origin of Gothic architecture remains a disputed historical question. It has been traced, plausibly enough, in part to an anti-Christian source in Saracenic examples, and ultimately to the avenues and arches of forests with their interlacing boughs, as also the foliage of the capitals of Corinthian columns is said to have been suggested by leaves accidentally growing about and embracing a stone placed upon a plant. Then as to its congeniality with the Christian ideas, the same thing may be affirmed with truth of all good architecture, or of all those styles and orders which in the lapse of time have commended themselves to the cultivated judgment of mankind. Every kind has its own predominant character and expression, and is felt to be accordingly congenial with some chief idea or class of ideas in the Christian revelation, as also in the nature of man. Comparing or rather contrasting a Greek and a Gothic edifice, each being a favorable specimen of its kind, an observer finds the difference pervading every part, extending to the minutest device or ornament, and carried out into the general effect; each building rising as it were from one conception of the mind, according to its own laws enlarging itself, and by coherence and unity coming to that harmonious result which is called (according to the position from which it is described) either the expression or impression of the whole: as two kinds of trees grow by their respective laws each into its proper beauty. For example, in Gothic architecture the lines are perpendicular or else slanting, the curves intersect one another as if all aspiring to greater

height, and by mechanical contrivance one part surmounts another to a great comparative elevation; and besides giving the pleasure of ingeniously overcoming difficulty in the construction, the whole has an air of loftiness, grandeur and natural solemnity, and sometimes of grace combined with vastness. In the Greek architecture on the other hand, the lines are for the most part horizontal, and the proportions of all the parts are nicely adjusted both for strength and effect on the eye; the whole making the impression of solidity or massiveness, and repose, and serenity; the Doric order having also the charm of the utmost simplicity, and the Corinthian of rich yet chastened decoration. Now the most critical minds, and the world at large, have for ages generally acknowledged this effect of the Greek orders to be quite congenial with the spirit of Christian worship; and such testimony avails more than the affirmation of any dogmatist. Nor is it of any moment that the same architectural effect was once allied with pagan worship; for the persons who make this objection find no difficulty in edifying themselves with certain ceremonies which the Catholic church borrowed from the idolatrous rites of heathen Rome.\* At the same time we make no question that the different effect of the Gothic style in those countries where it has been tried, whatever pagan or barbarous origin may be assigned to it, is also congenial with the spirit of Christian worship. The two effects, however diverse, ally themselves with different elements in religious truth, and different sensibilities of the human mind. We only

\* Newman in his *Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, (written before he became a Romanist,) acknowledges that many ceremonies, and some that are retained in the church of England, were in fact thus appropriated by the Catholic church as late as the fourth or fifth centuries. Not having the book at hand, we can not refer to the place.

complain of the exclusive partiality which many persons of taste now cherish for the one, as in past times for the other. Let us have both. The solemnities of the *Apocalypse*, such as the opening of the seals, and the pouring out of the vials, and 'the great white throne,' and the voices as of many waters and of mighty thunderings, and the dead, small and great, standing before God—these things we might feel with the most fearful interest when proclaimed under Gothic arches, sounding through 'long drawn aisle and fretted vault.' Paul's commendation of charity,\* and our Lord's last affectionate discourses to his disciples and intercession for them,† we could hear uttered not less suitably from beneath the Greek entablature, perhaps under the dome of St. Peter's. Paul's discourse of the resurrection‡ is so full at once of the solemnity of death and the cheerful hope of 'the redemption of our body,' that by reason of the one element or the other, it can not fail to harmonize with either kind of architectural accompaniment. The gateway of a cemetery in either style is found to comport with the place, in one aspect or another, and for the same reason either style is found to be essentially appropriate to a place of Christian worship. And what we have here said of Greek architecture in its several proper orders, and of what is strictly the Gothic style, may be applied also to those modifications of either, and those styles which partake more

or less of one or the other, which though of later date have a character and expression of their own. The imitations of the old Norman churches, and those that are called Romanesque, are at least akin to the proper Gothic, while such churches as St. Peter's and St. Paul's, though on the whole very unlike any Greek temple, are yet modifications of Greek or Roman forms, and derive from them their predominant effect. Among all the diversities of what may properly be called ecclesiastical architecture, something may be found adapted to all the varieties of Christian sentiment, and possibly some outward form answering to every inward type of Christian character and experience. However this may be, we are sure that a catholic liberality of sentiment ought to prevail on this subject as really as on any other, and will conduce more to improvement in church building than any exclusive or bigoted preference adopted by a fashionable clique or a religious sect.

We add the wish that those congregations in our large cities which erect churches worthy of being looked at, would make them easier of access to strangers, at least by the help of a notice on the building or a sexton in the vicinity. Travelers in Europe tell us that on the continent houses of worship are accessible at any time. In this particular they are symbolically evangelical, as we are taught that

‘The happy gates of gospel grace  
Stand open night and day.’

And herein we are obliged to conclude with Sterne, ‘They do these things better in France.’

\* 1 Cor. ch. 13. † John, chaps. 14-17.  
‡ 1 Cor. ch. 15.

## WEBSTER'S DICTIONARY.\*

WE can scarcely conceive of a more valuable contribution to the literature of a country, than a good dictionary of its language. He who prepares such a work, performs a service which entitles him to the gratitude both of cotemporaries and posterity. His labors are identified with the preservation of the language in its beauty and vigor, and its transmission as a correct vehicle of thought, from age to age. A good dictionary indeed, is an embodiment of the knowledge of a people—a sort of *fac simile* of the intellect and heart of the nation whose language it unfolds. In settling the

form and sound of words, in tracing their derivation, in defining their meaning, in sketching the change of each term from its primitive physical sense to the remoter abstract idea, and in marking the nice shades of thought expressed by peculiar uses, such a work performs the office of a general instructor. Carried moreover, to its proper extent, as illustrating, in many cases, the signification of phrases and the force of idiomatic expressions, and as giving the synonyms of the tongue, and establishing the legitimate use of words by reference to authorities, or by examples from approved writers, a dictionary imparts information, in a limited compass, of more importance than any other literary production. It constitutes an encyclopediæ, in its most condensed form. In it the essence of all learning is included; and the more encyclopediacal its character, if not too extended in bulk, the better for general use.

He who would produce such a work must possess or command the entire treasures of learning, embraced in the language of which he proposes to give a synopsis. His mind must be of the widest reach, and his taste of the most delicate susceptibility. He must be characterized by a love of research, by clear views of science, by refinement of thought, and by an appreciation of every species of intellectual beauty. The technical and learned term must be precisely explained, the evanescent idea seized with a view to give it form and coloring, the tenuous conception stereotyped, so that its image may be ever afterwards recognized. Few minds are adequate to such a task, or rather no single mind is able to do it perfect justice; and the most thoroughly furnished one can

\* *An American Dictionary of the English Language*; containing the whole Vocabulary of the First Edition in 2 vols. quarto; the entire Corrections and Improvements of the Second Edition in 2 vols. royal octavo; to which is prefixed an Introductory Dissertation on the Origin, History, and Connection of the languages of Western Asia and Europe, with an Explanation of the Principles on which languages are formed. *By Noah Webster, LL. D.*, member of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, &c. &c. General Subjects of the work: I. Etymologies of English Words deduced from an Examination and Comparison of Words of corresponding elements in Twenty Languages of Asia and Europe. II. The true Orthography of words as corrected by their etymologies. III. Pronunciation exhibited and made obvious by the Division of Words into Syllables, by Accentuation, by marking the sounds of the accented vowels when necessary, or by general Rules. IV. Accurate and Discriminating Definitions, illustrated when doubtful, or obscure, by Examples of their Use, selected from respectable Authors, or by familiar Phrases of undisputed Authority. Revised and Enlarged by *Chauncy A. Goodrich*, Professor in Yale College, with Pronouncing Vocabularies of Scripture, Classical and Geographical Names. Springfield, Mass. Published by George and Charles Merriam, corner of Main and State streets. 1848.

The same Work abridged in one volume royal octavo. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff street. 1847.

be supposed capable only of an approximation to the completeness demanded. It requires rather a combination of the talents and acquisitions of many minds, directed to that one point—an accumulation of the labors of generations, supplying the materials and shaping the course of study, so as to produce a work which shall answer fully the great end in view.

And yet singularly enough, the labors bestowed upon lexicography in the English tongue, appear to have been very inconsiderable, before the time of Johnson. Extending through the long period from Chaucer to that illustrious philologist, during which the prose of Hooker and Bacon, and the poetry of Spenser, Shakespeare and Milton, attested the raciness, the strength, and the harmony of our language, no work of any celebrity, ascertaining the orthography and defining the meaning of its terms, appeared. Bailey's Dictionary of the language in 2 vols. octavo, is scarcely an exception; much less the work of Philips, the nephew of Milton, quaintly entitled, *A New World of Words*. Even Johnson's production, though great for the times, and great as the labor of one man, supplied the desideratum but in part. No one acquainted with the subject can fail to see, that even his herculean intellect borne up by a herculean frame, was incompetent to grapple with all the difficulties of the task. And in the masterly preface to his dictionary, he has ingenuously and beautifully acknowledged the fact. It needed less the general scholar, the profound thinker, and the fine writer, to prepare a vocabulary of terms, with their derivations and definitions, than a person trained up in that particular study, directing all his efforts to that one point, having that single object in view as the end of his literary labors and acquisitions, laying under contribution for its attainment the whole energies of his intellect,

VOL. VI.

4

and living, moreover, in that period of the world when there was a sufficient preparation in the labors of others, for the accomplishment of such a design. Johnson made a great advance upon Bailey in the accuracy and fullness of his definitions; and yet tried by the standard of the present day, no small part of Johnson's definitions appear very deficient in logical precision and discriminating exactness. He defined, to a great extent, by a mere enumeration of synonyms, though on moral and literary subjects, he very often made admirably clear and discriminating statements. In the few scientific terms which he introduced, he is usually vague or erroneous. A telescope, according to him, is "a long glass by which distant objects are viewed." Coral is "a plant of a stony nature." Flame is "light emitted from fire."

Hence the necessity which existed after the time of Johnson, and especially after an interval of more than sixty years, for a new dictionary of our language. A work was needed on a more enlarged plan, and of a more scientific structure; giving fuller analogies, and nicer, more logical definitions; and embracing the numerous improvements in the language, caused by the progress of society, and the advancement of knowledge and the arts. It was reserved as an honor for one of our own countrymen, to conceive the true idea of a dictionary in its completeness, and to supply the obvious deficiency, in an age when a new order of things began to prevail, and the intellect of the world was awakened to unwonted efforts. Noah Webster, imbued with an early love of all knowledge and particularly of philology, having enjoyed a professional training which allowed him to rest in none but clear and logical definitions, gifted with a mind of unusual discrimination and vigor, and impelled by a desire of honorable fame and usefulness, embarked

in the undertaking. While England and English scholars were apparently but too well satisfied with the labors of Johnson, and extolled his dictionary as the *chef-d'œuvre* of the age, our author, who had already distinguished himself by several scholar-like productions in philology, viewed the matter in a somewhat different light. While he accorded all due praise to the corypheus of English literature, and appreciated the excellence of his dictionary in many points, he saw that in other respects it was defective or erroneous, and that much was needed to be supplied and amended for the perfection of such a work. Multitudes of additional terms demanded a place in the vocabulary, and numerous others required new and more logical definitions; to say nothing of the pleasure or profit of tracing the *origin* of words embraced in so rich and varied a tongue as the English. Not only was this the case in regard to the language as it existed in the days of Johnson; but much more so, after the expiration of so long a period, when increased knowledge and discovery had introduced into the language thousands of words unknown before, or known only with different ideas attached to them. Dr. Webster brought to the task the requisite learning, taste, and power of philosophical analysis, and was carried forward in his labors of twenty years, by an enthusiasm which submits to any extremity of toil and self-denial, in the hope of realizing the *ideal* which the mind has formed. He appears to have been properly conscious of his "manifest destiny," and was cheered under the severity of his exertions, and the incredulity or contempt which he was called to encounter, by the belief that he should at last produce a work, which his own age and posterity would duly appreciate. The result was the publication of the American Dictionary of the English Language, in

two vols. quarto, in 1828, than which a more valuable contribution to the literature of his native tongue was rarely, if ever, made by one man. That it was not perfect is freely acknowledged, and that no such work can be made perfect is equally certain; but it was, what no other publication could assume to be, an ample and learned dictionary of the language—of the language as it prevailed at that time, in its advanced state, diffusing its beauties of style and treasures of thought over a large part of two continents.

The author's extended and profound researches into his vernacular tongue, were not in vain. His book was received with favor both by the learned and the community at large. It was extensively adopted as a standard of the language, and its authority soon ranked among the highest, if not over the highest of its predecessors. The author lived to see it as revised from time to time, increasing in reputation and use, its merits acknowledged at home and abroad, and exerting every where an auspicious influence on the cause of literature. It is not too much to say, that it is now not only the first defining dictionary of the language in point of excellence, but the dictionary, the one needed, and generally recommended as of standard authority. Whoever inquires for the best work of this kind, whether in the booksellers' shops of London, or in the book markets of the United States, will be at once directed to the American Dictionary, either in the original quarto, or in the abridged octavo form, according to the size required.

That Dr. Webster improved upon Johnson, quite as much as Johnson did upon Bailey and his predecessors, will be conceded, we think, by all who have inquired into the subject. The more accurate and extended definitions of the English lexicographer he often adopted, for they could not be made better. But

be defined by *synonyms* far less than Johnson. His etymological inquiries were of signal service to him, in ascertaining the primary physical senses of words, from which the secondary senses branch off in orderly succession. He tells us indeed in his Preface, that he was driven to his investigations into the origin of words and the filiation of languages, by the impossibility of forming accurate and consistent definitions, without previously ascertaining the common bond which held the several meanings of a word together,—the fundamental idea which pervades them all, or from which some of them have been deflected by accidental causes. He was led in this way, and by the logical character of his early studies in the school of Blackstone, to form an *ideal* of a definition which was far more exact than that of any other English lexicographer; and it is this feature which has given to his dictionary, notwithstanding some abatements, its decided preëminence over every other, in the estimation of the public, both in this country and in England. In addition to this, he rendered very important service to the cause of lexicography, by introducing, for the first time, the most essential terms of science and art, now so extensively employed in periodicals and other literary works, as to require an explanation for the benefit of the general reader, as well as for the refreshment of the memories of the learned. Thus he gave to the world a dictionary containing twelve thousand words, and between thirty and forty thousand definitions, not to be found in any similar work in our language, and very greatly increased the number of additional terms, by his subsequent revisions. We have, therefore, in his work an admirable foundation on which to build a superstructure of continually increasing excellence. It ought, like the French Dictionary of the Academy,

to be made the subject of successive revisions, from time to time, which shall remove every error that may be detected, and enable it to keep pace with the steady advancement of our language, in the various departments of literature, science, and the arts.

That the present is a period at which such a revision was peculiarly desirable, will be obvious if we consider the progress which has been making in this country and Great Britain, on all subjects of a literary and scientific nature, during the last ten or fifteen years. The English mind, on both sides of the Atlantic, has been putting itself forth with an energy and compass of thought, never perhaps equaled at any former period. Science has made greater advances, art effected more extensive revolutions, speculation set up higher pretensions, discovery been reduced more completely to a system, and intelligence diffused more widely than ever before, thus adding new combinations of thought; while the facilities of traveling have brought the world together, and placed the intellect of both countries in the closest contact with the philosophy, politics, and literature of the most enlightened nations of the globe.

These powerful influences have been acting with correspondent force on our language. The characteristics of the age are impressed on the medium through which its thoughts are conveyed. Terms belonging to old theories have been revived or modified, in order to illustrate new doctrines. An immense number of words have been invented or borrowed from other languages, to explain new systems. Terms in familiar use have taken on them additional or peculiar significations, to mark nicer distinctions, or to accord with altered views. The classifications of science have to a great extent, been broken up and remodeled with a change of nomenclature. A

host of literary authors has arisen, among whom are men of peculiar habits of thought, or unwonted sources of illustration, who, by their commanding genius, have given a new cast to the literature of the age. Thus, besides the thousands of words which have been added to the various departments of science and art; a multitude of others, neither technical nor scientific, have made themselves room and a place in the language. The general result of these changes, though with some drawbacks, has been highly beneficial. They are the record of signal advances of the English intellect. Our language is becoming, on the whole, not only more copious in its vocabulary, more rich in its descriptive terms, more picturesque in its representations, more vivid in its colorings; but also more logical and exact, more nice in its discrimination of the various shades of thought, more free and bold in its constructions, and more thoroughly fitted to express the whole mind of a great, enlightened, and energetic people.

Connected with this progress, we may notice another change of the highest importance to the perfection of our language. It is the prevalence of much greater exactness in regard to *definitions*. Any one who examines our books of natural science as they were forty years ago, and compares them with correspondent works of the present day, will be struck with the improvement in this respect. The loose, vague, descriptive mode of identifying objects which then prevailed, has been exchanged for definite and discriminating statements, for a lucid exhibition of the various distinctive properties, by which the object in question may be known and recognized. In this respect, our men of science have gained much from the French naturalists, and may gain still more, by a careful imitation of these admirable models. A greater exactness of definition is beginning to prevail, in

most other branches of knowledge. The translation of several lexicons and grammars from the German language, and the consequent extension of the severe system of German philology, have elevated the views of many, especially among the learned. It is beginning to be generally felt that the definition of a word by *synonyms*, is no definition at all,—that such a description must be given as exhausts the characteristic properties of the thing described, and distinguishes each word, as far as possible, in all its senses, from every other term which may resemble it in meaning. Nothing can be more desirable than to see this attention to the exact import of language carried, in its full extent, throughout every department of life. “Accuracy of definition is essential to accuracy of thought.” In respect to most minds, in every community, it is emphatically true, as remarked by Mirabeau, that “words are things.” Every reflecting man knows, that multitudes are made the dupes of demagogues, by an artful use of terms and phrases which are the watchwords of party. It is a lamentable fact, that the most important moral distinctions are often overlooked or disregarded, for want of that clearness of perception which springs from accuracy in the use of language. Every good man mourns over the ruinous contentions in the church, the exhausting controversies between rival theologians, and the personal animosities between brethren of a common faith, which have sprung from careless and ambiguous phraseology,—from the want of meeting each other fairly on the ground of exact definition. The same effect has also proceeded from undue attachment to certain favorite forms of expression, and from undue dislike of others which have become the objects of jealousy or dread. Every advance, therefore in respect to correctness of definition, as it promotes correspondent progress in

general correctness of thought, must be regarded as a great and lasting benefit to the people among whom it obtains.

To record these advancements of our language, and to aid in reducing definition more completely to a science, is the appropriate office of a dictionary like this. For this purpose, a revision was necessary, extending to every department embraced within its limits. Such a revision our readers are aware was commenced some years ago, the results of which are now laid before us, in the volumes whose titles have been placed at the head of this paper. Their appearance, so long promised, and delayed only from the magnitude of the enterprise and the desire to satisfy every reasonable expectation, has been looked for by the public, with a lively interest. Nineteen years have elapsed since the first publication of the American Dictionary, and although the venerable author did all for its subsequent improvement, that could be fairly expected from one of his advanced years, it is obvious from what has been said above, that a minute, protracted, and searching revision of the work was due to the public. We rejoice that Prof. Goodrich, the editor, has been willing to apply his industry and learning in the present form, making the work of Dr. Webster, rather than any new design, the foundation of his labors. He has taken the only method, it is believed, in which we can obtain such a dictionary of our language as we need; and that is, to retain all the real and desirable improvements of the past, to shape and modify the work, from time to time, in agreement with the process of successive changes, and to superinduce whatever may have been incorporated into the language, as a permanent integral part. This the editor has attempted to do, and of his performance we design at present to give a succinct account.

The labors of Prof. Goodrich have been bestowed conjointly on the large dictionary of Dr. Webster and the octavo abridgment of it by Joseph E. Worcester, LL. D., which has been extensively circulated throughout our country. The former work, as here presented, consists of a royal quarto volume containing every thing embraced in the first edition, with the addition of a very large amount of highly valuable matter, which has been introduced into the work, in the successive revisions to which it has been subjected. All this, by the use of a smaller type and greater compression, has been brought within the compass of a single volume of fourteen hundred and forty-nine pages. The abridgment is a royal octavo of twelve hundred and eighty-nine pages, containing all the words, and the most important etymologies to be found in the quarto edition. "The definitions," as we are told in the Preface, "remain unaltered, except by an occasional compression in their statement. All the significations of words, as exhibited in the larger work are here retained, but the illustrations and authorities are generally omitted. In doubtful or contested cases, however, they are carefully retained." The revision, as stated above, has been extended equally to this and the quarto edition, and the results embodied in each, in due proportion, including all the additions and improvements made by Dr. Webster, in his successive revisions, down to the period of his death, enlarging the abridgment by a very great amount of the most interesting and important matter, and rendering it "on a reduced scale, a clear, accurate, and full exhibition of the American Dictionary, in all its parts."

No one, not even a professed reviewer, can be expected to read through a dictionary, of which the abridgment alone, if printed in the type and size of this review, would

fill nearly seven octavo volumes. We have endeavored, however, by an extended and careful examination, to acquaint ourselves fully with the improvements made by Prof. Goodrich. We have collated the revised edition with the old one, in almost every part of the volume, and as the result of the task, we feel a perfect conviction, that he has given to the work, a completeness, fullness, and accuracy, hitherto unattained in a work of this kind. The additions and emendations strike us as being singularly to the purpose, and adapted to satisfy the demands of an inquiring and advancing age. The great mass of words,—the old and familiar terms of the language,—have received sufficient attention, any new senses they may have acquired being carefully marked, while words of special interest, as connected with the exciting discussions of the present times, and with the principles of science and art more recently developed, have been more minutely defined and illustrated. A vast accession of materials, and a very great amount of labor and talent, have evidently been brought in, to render the work more complete as a standard of the English tongue, and as a depository of all its legitimate terms, with their appropriate meanings. In this revision the editor has spent nearly three years, with the addition of more than two years of labor by each of the gentlemen who assisted him. That his qualifications for the task were of a high order, none will doubt, who are acquainted with his clear, prompt, and highly practical intellect, with his ardor of mind and habits of industry, and with the course of his studies from early life, and especially during the last thirty years, the whole of which may be said to have been devoted to the culture of language. His relationship, as son-in-law, to Dr. Webster, may be supposed also to have given him important advantages for the work in question;

since from a full knowledge of the lexicographer's views, and a natural participation in his feelings, he would have the strongest motives to carry out the original plan of the work, and labor for its accomplishment to the extent of his power. How much may be accomplished during such a length of time, with the editor's rapidity of comprehension and thorough habits of study, and with able helpers, may be readily imagined. We should certainly be apt to expect correspondent improvements, and if we mistake not, they appear in the work.

Some of these we will now briefly notice in detail.

The addition of *Synonyms* to the abridgment, we deem a happy feature of the work. The space which they occupy is inconsiderable, while their utility is not small. To persons engaged in literary composition, oratory, or teaching, it is often desirable to have at hand a list of terms that are synonymous, or nearly synonymous in meaning. Their use relieves the page of the writer or the address of the speaker, from a tedious sameness that might otherwise be felt. The appearance of richness and variety in the expression, is always acceptable to the reader or hearer. As a matter, then, of easy reference, in a general dictionary, this arrangement can not but be appreciated. In such a shape we believe it is nowhere else found. Works in some respects similar have been constructed, as Carpenter's, and Perry's, for instance; but either for different purposes, or in less convenient forms. The plan of this portion of the work, as the editor states in his Preface, is the following. "Under each of the important words, all others having the same general signification are arranged together, except in cases where they have been previously exhausted in framing the definitions." Out of the list, a selection may be made at the option of those who may need

this aid. We refer our readers to a very few words as examples.

**A-BANDONED.** *SYN.* Forsaken; deserted; destitute; abject; forlorn; profligate; corrupt; vicious; depraved; reprobate; wicked; heinous; criminal; vile; odious; detestable.

**COMMON.** *SYN.* General; public; popular; national; universal; frequent; ordinary; customary; usual; familiar; habitual; vulgar; mean; trite; stale; threadbare; common-place.

**MOVE.** *SYN.* To stir; agitate; trouble; affect; persuade; influence; actuate; impel; rouse; prompt; instigate; incite; induce; incline; propose; offer.

**RUDE.** *SYN.* Rough; uneven; shapeless; unfastened; rugged; artless; unpolished; uncouth; inelegant; rustic; coarse; vulgar; clownish; raw; unskillful; untaught; illiterate; ignorant; uncivil; impolite; impertinent; saucy; impudent; insolent; surly; curvish; churlish; brutal; uncivilized; barbarous; savage; violent; fierce; tumultuous; turbulent; impetuous; boisterous; harsh; inclement; severe.

**SIMPLY.** *SYN.* Single; uncompounded; unmingled; unmixed; mere; uncombined; elementary; plain; artless; sincere; harmless; undesigned; frank; open; unaffected; artifical; unadorned; credulous; silly; foolish; shallow; unwise.

The richness of these several groups will be seen at once, and this is true of hundreds of others.

In the *Definitions*, which all acknowledge to be the most important part of a dictionary, numerous improvements have been made, in the present revision; as very great improvements certainly were made by Dr. Webster in his original work, over every one that preceded it. The editor has carried out the lexicographer's principles, and given no explanation of any important word (so far as we observe) by mere synonyms; but has enumerated the distinctive properties of the objects, and expressed them with great clearness and precision. There has evidently been an advance here, of the most desirable nature. The excellence of a definition lies chiefly in its distinctness and amplitude, separating, as it does, the term from every similar one, presenting its nicer shades of meaning, and exhausting the various senses in which it may be used. In this feature of the work, we have seen nothing superi-

or to it in the range of English literature. The most subtle individualizing, and the widest reach of combination, seem to have been brought to bear on the work, to give it a finished character as a *defining* dictionary. This remark, we think, will be abundantly verified by some specimens to be presently offered.

As a means of securing accuracy in correcting the definitions, the editor says—

“No efforts have been spared to obtain the most recent and valuable works, not only in lexicography, but in the various departments of science and the arts embraced in the American Dictionary. As these subjects are in a state of continual progress, every important word, in its various applications, has been diligently examined and compared with the statements made on each topic, by the latest and most approved authorities.”—*Pref.*, p. 2.

In addition to the latest English dictionaries, the editor enumerates between twenty and thirty special dictionaries and scientific works which were collated or used throughout, in the business of correction. These, we are gratified to say, are all standard works, most of them of recent date, such as—the *Oxford Glossary of Architecture*; *Dr. Ure's Dictionary of Manufactures, Arts and Mines*, with its *Supplement*; *Herbert's Engineer's and Mechanic's Cyclopedia*; *McCulloch's Commercial Dictionary*; *Partington's British Cyclopedia of Natural History*; *Jardine's Naturalist's Library*; *Campbell's Military Dictionary*, besides *Brande*, and the *Penny Cyclopedia*, &c. &c.

But the editor has not relied on himself alone in using these works. He has justly remarked—

“It is obviously impossible for any one mind to embrace with accuracy all the various departments of knowledge which are now brought within the compass of a dictionary. Hence arise most of the errors and inconsistencies which abound in works of this kind.”—*Pref.*, p. 3.

He has therefore obtained the assistance of different gentlemen, each distinguished in his own department, in revising and correcting the more difficult parts of the volume, espe-

cially the scientific portions. Of these, we find enumerated in the Preface, the names of Dr. JAMES G. PERCIVAL, who carried the revision of most of the articles through two letters of the alphabet; of the Hon. ELIJAH GOODRICH, who took charge of the articles on law; of the Rev. JAMES MURDOCK, D. D., to whom were assigned the departments of ecclesiastical history and ancient philosophy; of Prof. SILLIMAN, to whom the terms in chemistry were submitted; of Dr. WILLIAM TULLY, whose revision was extended to numerous articles in the departments of anatomy, physiology, medicine, botany, and some other branches of natural history; of Prof. GIBBS, who afforded aid on topics connected with oriental literature; of Prof. OLMSTED, who revised the articles on astronomy, meteorology, and natural philosophy; of Prof. STANLEY, to whom the definitions in mathematics were submitted; of JAMES D. DANA, Esq., whose revision included the sciences of geology and mineralogy, and whose assistance was bestowed on various other subjects; of EDWARD C. HERRICK, Esq., who furnished aid on practical astronomy and the science of entomology; and of NATHANIEL JOCELYN, Esq., under whose inspection passed many of the articles on painting and the fine arts. The efficient services of these gentlemen, each in his own portion of the work, in making the necessary additions, emendations, or corrections, are fully acknowledged.

It may likewise be noticed, that the editor, in furtherance of his object, carried on a correspondence with literary and scientific gentlemen in England, from whom information was solicited and received, on certain points, where published authorities were wanting, or could not be procured. In consequence of this measure, light has been thrown on the use of terms which, in England, have a peculiar sense.

Of these, some are of frequent occurrence at the universities, in the circles of trade, and in the familiar intercourse of life. The value of the minute knowledge thus gained will be felt by every reader among us, who has an interest in English history and customs.

This range of aid and inquiry gives the work, it will readily be seen, an advantage never before enjoyed by any English dictionary,—that of an encyclopedia, in which the labors of numerous individuals are combined to secure greater completeness and accuracy for the whole. Although we might rest with confidence on such evidence of the improvements made in this revision; yet according to our intimation above, we will give a few specimens of words, in different departments.

We refer to the word *Attraction*, so frequently employed in physical philosophy. The importance of a full and correct definition is obvious.

AT-TRACTION, *n.* 1. In *physics*, the power or force which draws bodies or their particles toward each other, or which causes them to tend toward each other, or to resist a counteracting tendency; or the law by which they tend toward each other, or resist a counteracting tendency.

*Attraction* is distinguished into that which is manifested between bodies or masses at sensible distances, and that which is manifested between the particles or molecules of bodies at insensible distances. The former includes the *attraction of gravity*, or *gravitation*, or the mutual tendency of all bodies to each other, as the tendency of the planets toward the sun, or of a stone, when raised in the air, to fall to the earth; and also, the *attraction of magnetism*, and that of *electricity*. The latter takes place either between particles of the same kind, or homogeneous particles, and is then called the *attraction of aggregation*, or *cohesion*; or between dissimilar or heterogeneous particles, uniting them into compounds, and is then called *chemical attraction*, or *affinity*. The attractions of the first class, however, exist between particles as well as masses; and the surfaces of masses in contact, or at inappreciable distances, also attract each other, causing *adhesion*, in heterogeneous as well as homogeneous bodies.

The *attraction of gravity* is supposed to be the great principle which confines the planets in their orbits. Its power or force is *directly* as the quantity of matter in a body, and *inversely* as the squares of the distances of the attracting bodies.

2. The act of attracting; the effect of the principle of attraction.
3. The power or act of alluring, drawing to, inviting, or engaging; *as*, the attraction of beauty or eloquence.

*Elective attraction*, or *elective affinity*, in chemistry, is the tendency of those substances in a mixture to combine, which have the strongest attraction.

This must be pronounced a clear and sufficient explanation of the term, in its various uses.

We turn to the word *Transcendentalism*, a word of comparatively modern origin, and essential to the right understanding of the profound speculations of a class of philosophers. The explanation of the term given by Dr. Murdock, is to us highly instructive, and may be noticed as an instance of that improvement in definition, by which this volume is so often characterized.

**TRANS-CEND-ENTALISM.**, *n.* In the *Kantian philosophy*, the transcending or going beyond empiricism, and ascertaining *a priori* the fundamental principles of human knowledge. But, as Schelling and Hegel claimed to have discovered the absolute identity of the objective and subjective in human knowledge, or of things and human conceptions of them, the Kantian distinction between *transcendent*\* and *transcendental* ideas can have no place in their philosophy. And hence, with them, *transcendentalism* claims to have a true knowledge of all things material and immaterial, human and divine, so far as the mind is capable of knowing them. And in this sense the word *transcendentalism* is now most used.—Murdock. The word is also sometimes used for that which is vague and illusive in philosophy.

Of the word *Orotund*, the definition is succinct and beautiful, and given in language whose sound is almost an echo of the sense.

**O'RO-TUND.**, *n.* A mode of intonation directly from the larynx, which has a fullness, clearness, strength, smoothness, and ringing or musical quality, which forms the highest perfection of the human voice.—Rush.

We are glad to see the word *Apodosis* fully explained in this edition. It had previously been given from Johnson, as “the application or latter part of a similitude.” The term is a grammatical one now

\* This word in the philosophy of Kant, denotes transcending or going beyond the bounds of human knowledge, and is applied to that which is baseless or illusive.

much used, and every pupil should know its precise meaning. This is given in the text.

**A-POD-O-SIS.**, *n.* [Gr.] In grammar, the principal clause of a conditional sentence, expressing the *result*; as distinguished from the *protasis* or subordinate clause, which expresses a condition. Thus, in the sentence, “*Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him*,” the former clause is the *protasis*, and the latter the *apodosis*. By some respectable grammarians, this distinction is not confined to conditional sentences, but is extended to others similarly constructed.

**Ecbatic**, a recent term in grammar, very properly has a place in this work, the definition of which is concisely given and illustrated. The illustration shows how it is distinguished from the word *telic*, also a new term.

The word *Boodhism*, as explained in the present work, claims our attention.

**BOODHISM.**, *n.* A system of religion in Eastern Asia, embraced by more than one third of the human race. It teaches that, at distant intervals, a *Boodh*, or deity, appears, to restore the world from a state of ignorance and decay, and then sinks into a state of entire non-existence, or rather, perhaps, of bare existence without attributes, action, or consciousness. This state, called *Nirvana*, or *Nicban*, is regarded as the ultimate supreme good, and the highest reward of virtue among men. Four *Boodhs* have thus appeared in the world, and passed into *Nirvana*, the last of whom, *Gaudama*, became incarnate about 600 years before Christ. From his death, in 543 B. C., many thousand years will elapse before the appearance of another; so that the system, in the mean time, is practically one of pure atheism. The objects of worship, until another *Boodh* appears, are the *relics* and *images* of *Gaudama*.

The information here presented is curious, and well deserves the notice of the reader.

The terms *Subjective* and *Objective* are explained with scientific precision, and nothing seems to be wanting to make their separate senses perfectly clear and obvious. We quote *Subjective* alone, as being the more fully explained.

**SUB-JECTIVE**, *a.* An epithet applied to those internal states of thought or feeling of which the mind is the *subject*; opposed to *objective*, which is applied to things considered as separate from the mind, and as *objects* of its attention. Thus, *subjective* truth or reality is that which is verified by consciousness; *objective* truth or reality is that which results

from the nature and relations of things. A *subjective* motive is an internal feeling or propensity; an *objective* motive is something external to the mind, which is suited to awaken desire. *Subjective* views are those which are produced or modified by internal feeling; *objective* views are those which are governed by external objects. That which is *subjective* in one relation may be *objective* in another. Thus, *subjective* states of mind, when recalled and dwelt on for the purpose of inspection or analysis, become *objective*.—Encyc. Amer.

The correlative terms *subjective* and *objective*, it is needless to say, are now much used in philosophy, as adopted from German writers, and should stand out each clearly identified in its meaning. This is one of the cases in which a marked improvement might be expected in respect to definitions. It is strikingly seen by comparing the above with the current definition of *subjective*, as given from Johnson in the former edition, where its meaning is simply stated to be, "Relating to the *subject*, as opposed to the *object*."

The word *Sensation* is very happily defined in its several meanings.

**SEN-SATION**, *n.* 1. In *mental philosophy*, an impression made upon the mind through the medium of the *senses*. It differs from perception, which is the *knowledge* of external objects consequent on sensation. 2. Feeling awakened by external objects, or by some change in the internal state of the body; *as*, a *sensation* of heaviness, &c. 3. Feeling awakened by immaterial objects; *as*, *sensations* of awe in the divine presence. 4. A state of excited interest or feeling; *as*, "the *sensation* caused by the appearance of that work is still remembered by many."—Brougham.

In the earlier editions of the dictionary, it was given from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, as "the perception of external objects by means of the *senses*."

On the definition of the word *Induction*, we might comment, if necessary. It is an instance of so clear and philosophic an explanation, that no reflecting mind, as appears to us, but must dwell upon it with pleasure.

**IN-DUCTION**, *n.* 1. *Literally*, a bringing in; introduction; entrance. 2. The bringing forward of particulars, or individual cases, with view to establish some general conclusion. 3. A kind of argument which infers respecting a whole class what has been

ascertained respecting one or more individuals of that class—Whately. This is the *inductive method* of Baron, and is the direct reverse of logical deduction. It ascends from the parts to the whole, and forms, from the general analogy of nature or special presumptions in the case, conclusions which have greater or less degrees of force, and which may be strengthened or weakened by subsequent experience. It relates to actual existences, as in physical science or the concerns of life. Deduction, on the contrary, descends from the whole to some included part; its inferences are necessary conclusions according to the laws of thought, being merely the mental recognition of some particulars, as included and contained in something general. 4. The inference of some general truth from all the particulars embraced under it, as legitimated by the laws of thought, and abstracted from the conditions of any particular matter. This may be called *metaphysical* induction, and should be carefully distinguished from the illations of physics spoken of above. 5. The conclusion or inference drawn from a process of induction. 6. The introduction of a person into an office by the usual forms and ceremonies. 7. In *electricity*, an influence exerted by an electrified body through a non-conducting body without any apparent communication of a spark.—Olmsted. 8. In *old plays*, an introductory scene leading to the main action.

Of the word *Reformed*, a full and satisfactory definition is given, which the student will recognize as being necessary, from the want of such definition in other vocabularies.

**RE-FORMED** (re-form'd), *pp.* 1. Restored to good state; amended; corrected.—2. *a.* In *ecclesiastical history*, a term denoting, in its widest sense, all who separated from the Roman Catholic Church at the era of the Reformation. In a more specific sense, it denotes those who separated from Luther on the doctrine of consubstantiation, &c., and carried the reformation, as they claimed, to a higher point. The Protestant churches founded by them in Switzerland, France, Holland, and part of Germany, were called the *Reformed churches*.—Encyc. Am.

In the large number of words which we have taken the pains to collate and examine, we have not remarked an instance of a loose, careless, or illogical definition, remaining. Of the philosophic, as well as poetic character of our language,—of its capacity for logical precision, as well as for passionate painting,—of its adaptation to express sound sense and severe reasoning, equally with the finer play of the imagination,—of its fitness as the dialect both of the mind and the heart, at one time sounding the

depths of science, and at another stirring up the intense emotions of the bosom, we have seen the most convincing proof, in examining these graphic definitions. There is about many of them the delicate touch, the clear delineation, the perfect expression of a *daguerreotype* likeness.

We find numerous terms in this volume explained with clearness, for the first time, particularly a considerable number used in the English universities, and therefore interesting to scholars. Prof. Goodrich, from his connection with a college, seems to have taken a peculiar interest in ascertaining the exact sense of the terms most used at these seats of learning. Among those terms are the *Senate*, *Syndic*, *Proctor*, *Moderator*, *Taxor*, *Responsion*, *Sizar*, *Servitor*, *Pensioner*, *Gentleman pensioner*, *Commoner*, *Fellow commoner*, *Public Orator*, *Regent*, *Non-regent*, *Tripos-paper*, *Sophister*, or *Soph.* The latter contains an interesting statement. The word *Sophomore* has generally been considered as an Americanism, being at present unknown at the English universities. The editor has given the result of an investigation of the subject, which shows, that the word must have been derived from the university of Cambridge in England, having been there employed as a cant term, under the spelling of *Soph-Mor*, though it has almost ceased to be known, even as such a term, at the place of its origin.\* We should like to quote the account in his own language, as given in the dictionary, but our limits will not permit the insertion. In connection with this we would observe, that the information which is given us respecting the term *sophister*, is what we do not find in other dictionaries.

Some thousands of words have been added in the course of this revision. As a specimen of these ad-

ditions the following may be mentioned, viz. to *abduct*, v. t., *air-plant*, *alarm-clock*, *armature* (of a magnet), *anastatic-printing*, *argand*, *astral*, and *carcel lamp*, *baptism* (hypothetical), *beeswax*, *black-walnut*, *black-vomit*, *bench-warrant*, *blue-stocking*, *bobbinet*, *bengal-light*, *brass-band*, *boulevard*, *brassels-sprouts*, *bud-light*, *bulbal*, *careat* (in patents), *chaparral*, to *chair* a person, *chari-vari*, *chilfern-hundreds*, *club-house*, *clearing-house*, *contrast*, v. i., *coupé* (part of a French diligence), *combination-room* (at Cambridge), *coupon*, *drummond-light*, *eminent-domain* (in law), *eulogistic*, *flying-buttress*, *fancy-ball*, *faro-bank*, *fissiparism*, *free-port*, *ground-form* (in grammar), *gradient*, *gun-cotton*, *herds grass*, *hedge* (in betting), *hospice*, to *ignore* (in law), *lay-figure*, *left-handed* or *morganic marriage*, *lilliputian*, *lombard-house*, *leverage*, *letter of credit*, *lunch*, v. i., to *limber* and *unlimber* guns, *middle-man* (in Ireland), *messianic*, *maiden-as-size*, *malestrom*, *ormolu*, *orotund*, *papier-mache*, *prairie-dog*, *philopena*, *poudrette*, *propeller*, *polka*, *paleozoic*, *pre-pay*, *pre-payment*, *Puseyism*, *pass-book*, *punka*, *port-fire*, *quantitative* and *qualitative* (in chemistry), *quippa*, *quizzical*, *rancho*, *ranchero*, *red-letter day*, *rouge et noir*, *rocking-stone*, *refrigerator*, to *rack* (for amble), *rosette*, *safety-value*, *shake-down*, *serial*, *soofeism*, *stampede*, *stand-point*, *Swedenborgian*, *spittoon*, *shako*, *silicin*, *sessional*, *sewerage*, *sleaple-chase*, *sanitary*, *sea-letter*, *supervisory*, *spatch-cock* [Eng.], *steam-whistle*, *tram-road*, *true-blue*, *trappean*, *ticket-porter*, *turn-table*, *teocalli*, *upheaval*, *union* (of a flag), *vegetable-ivory*, *ware-housing system*, &c. &c. This list might be enlarged to any extent, showing that the words added are not local, or unimportant, but most of them such as demand an explanation. The editor, in his Preface, has judiciously laid down the principles on which he has admitted new words into this

\* Its generally supposed etymology would therefore seem to be a mistake.

volume. He would observe a medium between the licentiousness now prevalent, especially in England, and the refusal to adopt such terms as from frequent and necessary use, seem to require an insertion. He might have enlarged the catalogue to a much greater length, especially in regard to technical and scientific terms; but he has felt the necessity rather of abridgment than of extension. It should be remarked, that among the very proper additions that have been made, in part by Dr. Webster and in part by the editor, is the insertion of several hundred words from the learned or foreign languages, which are frequently quoted in English literature. They are printed in Italics to show that they are not naturalized, and have the pronunciation marked. Of this class the following words or phrases are a specimen—*personnel*, *regime*, *résumé*, *dénouement*, *qui vive*, *proces-verbal*, *sub-rosa*, &c.

In numerous instances new significations have been added to words already in the language. Thus the sense of *absorption* for entire occupation; *adventure* for striking occurrence; *accident* for a casual and unfortunate occurrence; *remonstrance* for a frame in which the host is elevated in Roman Catholic churches; *alternate* for substitute in some ecclesiastical bodies; to *appropriate* for to set apart or vote money; *appropriation* in a correspondent sense; *ascetic* for one who practices undue rigor or self-denial in religious things; a *scene* for an exhibition of pathetic or passionate feeling between two or more persons; *recent* in geology denoting subsequent to the creation of man; to *propose* for offer one's self in marriage; *leader* for the leading editorial in a newspaper, are examples of additions in this respect. So also the peculiar significations of the words which are italicised, in the following phrases, have been added in this revision. The *attachment* of a

muscle, the *approach* of a country-seat, a *block* of buildings, the *safe* of a bank, an orphan *asylum*, a masonic *lodge*, a ship's *register*, a *running* fire, a *plunging* fire, to *muster* troops into service or out of service, to *abstract* goods from a parcel, the *abstraction* of money, the *right* side of a piece of cloth, to *rate* a chronometer, to *wind* a ship, &c.

We notice nice and learned distinctions, or more exact ones than formerly, added to the meanings of the words, *natural*, *naturalism*, *nativity*, *outfit*, *reciprocal*, *rectification*, *secondary*, *secular*, *spherical*, *fore-shorten*, *granulation*, *hypochondria*, *machine*, *axis*, *azote*, *concrete*, *discrete*, *drift*, *entrepol*, *essential*, *gauge*, *function*, *debris*, and others which we have examined.

The origin of phrases or words is often accounted for by the editor, in a new and interesting manner, as the following, for instance, to *send to Coventry*, to *show the white feather*, to *curse by bell, book, and candle*, *red-letter day*, *all-spice*, *wall-eye*, *wall-eyed*, *Charles's-wain*, *vignette*, &c.

Our readers will perceive that Prof. Goodrich has marked most of the words which are peculiar to our country, as, *appreciate* for rise in value, and stigmatized many expressions in general use among us, as a *bad fix*, *balance* for remainder, &c. He has also noted a class of words which have been considered as the coinage of our country, but which were brought with them, by our ancestors from Great Britain, and are still used there as local or provincial terms. In his Preface he observes—“The recent investigations of Forby, Holloway, and Halliwell have thrown much light on the subject; and the names of these authors are therefore frequently placed under the words in question, to indicate their origin and their present use in England.” In regard, then, to the class of words which are supposed to be exclusively employed

in the United States, the editor, we believe, has done all that was requisite to indicate what are legitimate words, and what ones should be discarded from the language. The circumstances in which we are placed as a nation, may authorize the use of a few terms that are not common to the tongue, and are employed to represent objects that are not known elsewhere; and the editor thinks they are comparatively few.

The subject of *Orthography* is almost the only one, in respect to which objections to Dr. Webster's dictionary, have been generally prevalent. On this point, the editor, it is believed, has made all reasonable concessions to the public feeling and opinion. Important alterations in this respect appear in these volumes, since he has restored numerous words to the old established spelling, while he has endeavored at the same time, to maintain throughout the work, a correct and consistent system. Dr. Webster's changes of orthography were founded on two different grounds, one of which was that of *etymology*. It seemed to him proper that a principle generally so clear, should be adopted as a guide in spelling, especially as the learned would be able to estimate its importance. He accordingly made changes, in certain classes of words, in agreement with this principle. But although many of the intelligent of this country, and numbers of European critics highly approved the measure, he found that the mass of the community were still strongly attached to the old mode of spelling. The convictions produced by a twelve years' trial, resulted in his restoring to a considerable number of such words the accustomed orthography. In the present edition, that orthography is restored in nearly all of this class that remained, including such words as *chemistry*, *fether*, *hainous*, *maiz*, *melasses*, *ribin*, *zink*, &c. The editor assigns as the reason, that "as

they (i. e. this class of Dr. W.'s changes) do not relate to the general analogies of the language, and can not be duly appreciated by the body of the people, they will never be generally received." In the light of criticism and strict propriety, however, we may be permitted to say, that the necessity of abandoning them is to be regretted, inasmuch as when we go back to the etymology of a word, we take it in its simple and pure form, in which it can best be recognized; and it is not without some mortification, that we contrast the ready acquiescence of the German nation in such changes of orthography, with the stout resistance of the English people. We doubt not that the editor has done wisely in this matter, and that thus the work will be rendered more acceptable to the community; for changes, though improvements they may be, and desirable in themselves, if in advance of the public feeling, or in opposition to it, are after all, of questionable utility.

The other ground of changes in orthography was that of *analogy*. The principle which Dr. Webster maintained here, and justly maintained, was, that "the tendencies of our language to greater simplicity and broader analogies, ought to be watched and cherished with the utmost care. He felt, therefore, that whenever a movement towards wider analogies and more general rules, had advanced so far as to leave but few exceptions to impede its progress, these exceptions ought to be set aside at once, and the analogy rendered complete." He therefore struck out the letter *u* from all such words as *farour*, *honour*, &c., the number being now very small in which the *u* is retained by any one. In this, his example has been very generally followed in our country, and the omission of the letter has proved a great convenience. On similar grounds, he proposed to change *re* into *er* in such words as

*centre, metre, &c.*, there being but fifteen or twenty left, out of some hundreds belonging to this class; all of which may be easily conformed to analogy, except some two or three, whose proper pronunciation might be endangered by the change. The doubling of the *l* in such words as *libelling, levelling, travelling, &c.* he omitted in accordance with one of the best established principles of the language, namely, that it is only when the accent falls on the *last* syllable, that the consonant ending the word to which a formative is added, should be doubled—not when the accent falls on any preceding syllable. This change was first recommended by Bishop Lowth, and was strongly approved by Walker. Why an exception should ever have been made in respect to *l*, it is difficult to say. Again; the letter *s* instead of *c*, is now generally introduced into the spelling of the words formerly written *expence, licence, recompence*, because the former consonant is the only one used in the derivatives, as *expensive, &c.* On the same ground the words *offense, pretense, defense*, require the same alteration, and have received it from the hand of Dr. Webster. These changes would be regarded by every one as improvements, if they could only be rendered familiar to the public eye. The whole difficulty lies in the force of habit and association. This is daily becoming less, for Dr. Webster's orthography in these respects, has been extensively adopted in various parts of our country; and the public will be much more likely to approve them, since the reasons derived from analogy are more easily perceived and appreciated than those dependent on etymology. In the present revision, Prof. Goodrich has very properly given the orthography of the contested words, for the most part in both ways.

The subject of *Pronunciation* has been somewhat canvassed in connection with Dr. Webster's system.

Efforts have at times been made to underrate him as being deficient or erroneous, upon some points, in this department. But time, we believe, has worked some changes, and will work more, in favor of his pronunciation, as a whole. It has been sanctioned, to a great extent, by the best speakers both in England and America. In respect to particulars in which he differs from other orthoëpists, his reasons seem to have been thoroughly weighed. Each orthoëpist has his peculiarity, all differ from one another in some respects, and no one has hit that exact point which can command the suffrages of all, and produce a universality of practice. There are cases of disputed pronunciation which probably never will be settled. The most approved speakers differ, and that only can be the best pronunciation, which obtains the consent of the largest number of the well-educated and well-bred of a nation—the more prevailing practice in the circles of taste, refinement, and intelligence. Dr. Webster's method of pronunciation comes more nearly to such practice, there is reason to think, than that of most of our orthoëpists. He regarded, for instance, the long or open sound of *u* as, in most cases, a peculiar vowel sound, nearly resembling *e* and *oo*, but so much closer as to be hardly a diphthong; and considered it as taking the full diphthongal sound, *eo* or *yo*, only when it begins a syllable, or when it is heard in certain terminations, as *ure, &c.* We believe he has good reason for his position here, and that the general practice is in his favor. The words *lute* and *June*, for example, are not, on the one hand, pronounced *loot*, *Joon*, nor on the other, *leoot*, *Jeoon*, giving *u* the full diphthongal utterance of *e* or *y* and *oo*. The true sound is a closer one between them. This was seen by Smart, the latest and one of the ablest, of English orthoëpists; and he has accordingly

invented a peculiar character to indicate this closer sound, and to guard against the full diphthongal utterance, which he stigmatizes as *affected*. Dr. Webster, in settling the sound of the other vowels, and also the accentuation of words, was guided, in general, we believe, by good taste and sound judgment. In the revision before us, the editor appears to have bestowed much labor on this part of the work, and has studiously adapted it to the wants of the community. He says in the Preface, "a careful comparison has been made with the latest authorities, and whenever changes have seemed advisable and could be made in consistency with the author's principles, they have been introduced. Many thousand words have been re-spelled, and no efforts have been spared to render the work, in all respects, a complete pronouncing dictionary." The system of notation has been somewhat extended, but is less minute and complicated than that of several other orthoëpiasts, and is for that reason more clear and satisfactory. Dr. Webster, as the editor thinks, wisely avoided attempting too much, as to marking the pronunciation. For information, aside from what is embraced in the body of the work, respecting a large number of words differently pronounced by different orthoëpiasts, the reader is referred to the *Synopsis* contained in the 8vo abridgment which was prepared by Mr. Worcester for the edition of 1829, and which, as here inserted, has undergone an entire remodeling.

An Appendix has been added to the large work containing "a list of Greek and Latin Proper names, with their pronunciation, prepared by Prof. Thacher of Yale College; and a list of Scripture Proper Names, prepared by Prof. Porter of Yale College." In the Appendix to the abridgment, Walker's Key to the Pronunciation of Classical and Scripture Names has been enlarged, and

improved. From the most approved English authorities more than three thousand words have been added to it, and numerous mistakes in it rectified, under the revision of Prof. Thacher. These lists are a most valuable guide to the pronunciation of names of frequent occurrence, both in classical and general reading.

The value of the two volumes is further greatly enhanced by the addition to each of them, of a **VOCABULARY GIVING THE PRONUNCIATION OF MODERN GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES**. It is hardly necessary to say how much a guide of this kind is needed, on the part of a large class in the community. The want has been pressingly felt, especially since the more general attention paid to geographical studies in our schools and academies; and as it could not be readily supplied unless brought within the compressed limits of a general dictionary, ignorance and embarrassment have been the consequence among both teachers and pupils, in this department. Great pains appear to have been taken to give to those vocabularies the desired fullness and accuracy, an interesting account of which and of the principles on which they have been constructed, is presented in the Prefatory Remarks.

In its appropriate place, we have spoken of the intellectual and literary qualifications of Dr. Webster for compiling a dictionary of our language; but it may gratify our readers, and is moreover especially consonant with one main design of this journal, to exhibit a brief view of his religious feelings, and the closing scene of his earthly labors. This we shall do by giving a single extract from a *Memoir* of the author prepared by Prof. Goodrich, and prefixed to the quarto volume. Our readers will feel the touching interest of the detail; as a perusal also of the entire *Memoir*, from the clear, condensed account which it gives of

the principal productions of Dr. Webster's pen, its lively sketch of the most striking traits of his character, the chastened spirit which pervades it, and the graceful style in which it is written, must be highly gratifying to every admirer of our distinguished lexicographer. The extract immediately follows a description of the interesting events, connected with Dr. Webster's public profession of religion, at the age of fifty years.

"In his religious feelings, Dr. Webster was remarkably equable and cheerful. He had a very strong sense of the providence of God, as extending to the minutest concerns of life. In this he found a source of continual support and consolation, under the severe labors and numerous trials which he had to endure. To the same divine hand he habitually referred all his enjoyments; and it was known to his family, that he rarely, if ever, took the slightest refreshment, of any kind, even between meals, without a momentary pause, and a silent tribute of thanks to God as the giver. He made the Scriptures his daily study. After the completion of his Dictionary, especially, they were always lying on his table, and he probably read them more than all other books. He felt, from that time, that the labors of his life were ended, and that little else remained but to prepare for death. With a grateful sense of past mercies, a cheering consciousness of present support, and an animating hope of future blessedness, he waited with patience until his appointed change should come.

"During the spring of 1843, Dr. Webster revised the Appendix of his Dictionary, and added some hundreds of words. He completed the printing of it about the middle of May. It was the closing act of his life. His hand rested, in its last labor, on the volume which he had commenced thirty-six years before. Within a few days, in calling on a number of friends in different parts of the town, he walked, during one afternoon, between two and three miles. The day was chilly, and immediately after his return, he was seized with faintness and a severe oppression on his lungs. An attack of peripneumony followed, which, though not alarming at first, took sudden turn after four or five days, with fearful indications of a fatal result. It soon became necessary to inform him that he was in imminent danger. He received the communication with surprise, but with entire composure. His health had been so good, and every bodily function so perfect in its exercise, that he undoubtedly expected to live some years longer. But though suddenly called, he was completely ready. He gave some characteristic directions as to the disposal of his body after death. He spoke of his long life as one of uniform enjoyment, because filled up at every stage with active labors for some valuable end. He expressed his entire resignation to the will of God, and his unshaken trust in the atoning blood of the

Redeemer. It was an interesting coincidence, that his former pastor, the Rev. Mr. Stuart, who received him to the church thirty-five years before, had just arrived at New Haven on visit to his friends. He called immediately; and the interview brought into affecting comparison the beginning and the end of that long period of consecration to the service of Christ. The same hopes which had cheered the vigor of manhood, were now shedding a softened light over the decay and sufferings of age. 'I know in whom I have believed,'—such was the solemn and affecting testimony which he gave to his friend, while the hand of death was upon him,—'I know in whom I have believed, and that He is able to keep that which I have committed to him against that day.' Thus, without one doubt, one fear, he resigned his soul into the hands of his Maker, and died on the 28th day of May, 1843, in the eighty-fifth year of his age."—*Memoir*, p. 22.

We have the most sanguine expectations that the editor's efforts, in this arduous undertaking, will not be without correspondent results, in reference to the objects he has in view. That the work will be decidedly propitious to the interests of literature and sound learning, and especially to a better understanding of the English tongue, in its present improved state—its power, compass, variety, and beauty—seems to us a matter of demonstration. A revision of Webster's dictionary, so thorough, minute, and extended, and prosecuted on a plan calculated to secure the highest accuracy, through the labors of gentlemen, each distinguished in his own sphere of inquiry, is a sufficient guarantee of its excellence. We can not but view it as a sort of representative of the English mind in its present advanced state—as a transcript in miniature of the intellectual progress of the age—as a synopsis of arts, science, philosophy, truth in nature and truth in morals; in fine of all knowledge within the range of human investigation, so far as these may be exhibited through the great medium of thought. The satisfaction derived from a clear, full, and consistent definition is worth any effort which it may cost, and to all who search for truth such definition is indispensable. We believe that there is not, within the compass of English

literature, a work which, in this respect, will meet the expectations of all who consult a dictionary, so entirely as the one which has drawn forth these comments. In this feature of the work, as we have seen, it will bear the test of the severest scrutiny. In respect to the other uses of a dictionary, as a guide to

etymology, orthography, pronunciation, &c. we believe it may be relied on with equal confidence. As, however, the public is the final arbiter in this case, we will not assume to forestall its decision, though we doubt not what it will be, in regard to the entire character of this great work.

### MISSIONARY OPERATIONS IN POLYNESIA.\*

"It may be remarked here that travelers who visit missionary establishments sometimes contribute to existing errors. If they write in favor of them, they wish to do it to some purpose—they wish, of course, to be popular, in an age which asks for new and exciting matter from the press. Hence we have seen books professing to give the state of things at the Society, Sandwich, and even Marquesas Islands, written in a style of extravagance, adapted rather to gratify than to inform the reader. There are other travelers who fall into the other extreme. It is a point with them to show that the missionary enterprise does no good; that it impoverishes and depopulates the Islands, and that the natives who survive its pestilential influence are made more idle, filthy and vicious. The reader needs not to be informed that it is an old usage among men to comfort one's conscience by an effort to lay its guilt on the back of another. Neither does the public, we presume, need to be informed that if any one goes down into Egypt after the corn of scandal—the sins of missionaries—he will find the stowards of the granaries on board his craft before he can anchor, and the sack filled, and the money also returned in the sack's mouth—at so cheap a rate do they supply the wants of their brethren."—*Hawaiian Spectator*, Vol. i, p. 99.

EVER since the day when Vasco Nugnez de Balboa, in 1513, ascended the mountain height from which he beheld the wide waste of waters till then unknown to Europeans, and the year 1520, when Magalhanes discovered the straits which bear his name, the Pacific has been a broad field for the enterprise and the sympathies of the civilized world. With its waters laving the pole itself, and anon sweeping along the untrdden shores or the densely peopled strands of two continents, now crystallizing into icy fields or melting beneath a tropical sun—and nestling in its bosom ten thousand islands of every size and form, bearing a numerous population of many climes, it has gradually become more and more known to the people of the old worlds, and they behold in the revelation of

these new members of the human family, another volume of that unwritten Providence which will yet bring all men into a common brotherhood of interest and of destiny.

The progress of discovery was slow for many ages. Occasionally a navigator commissioned by the cours of Madrid or of Lisbon, ventured across the desert of waters, making known to the world a dim and uncertain narrative of adventure some where within a score of degrees near the scenes so vaguely described. Tasman, the Dutch navigator, discovered the Tonga or Friendly Islands in 1643, Alvaro Mendano discovered the Marquesas in 1595, Pedro Fernandez de Quiros visited an island supposed to be Tahiti, on the 10th February, 1606. But comparatively few of the other islands were known until toward the close of the last century, when Wallis, on the 19th June, 1767, anchored at Tahiti, and gave an impetus to the

\* *Omoo*; by Herman Melville. London: John Murray. New York: Harper & Brothers.

maritime discovery so speedily and brilliantly followed up by La Perouse, De Bougainville, Cook, Bligh, Vancouver, and others. The narratives of these explorers were filled with astonishing and intensely interesting details concerning the islands, their climate, productions, natural history, and particularly their inhabitants. They painted the islands in such glowing colors as led the people of the civilized world to believe, that at last, in these far off isles, man had been found surrounded with all the necessary natural and physical enjoyments and sources of happiness. The refined ideas of delicacy and propriety entertained by all—the mildness of disposition, the openness of character, the generosity and hospitality they manifested to foreigners, their affectionate regard for each other, their filial virtues, and a thousand other excellencies, combined with the natural scenery, to make these isles the very gardens of terrestrial happiness.

These attractive descriptions of Polynesian character and life, however, are in a great measure qualified by the existence of manners and customs which cast a shade upon the fairer portions of the picture. Invest, if you will, the character of the child of nature with all that may be found lovely and joyous in the uncultivated soul—weave round him garlands of flowers culled from the fondest imaginings and most genial emotions of the refined beholder—enrobe him voluptuously in the fairest gossamer ever wrought into poetry—yet, after all, the whole truth will not be told. He may be nursed in a paradise of physical enjoyment, he may possess the largest liberty, he may sport with the waves, grapple with the monsters of the deep, and become a fit subject for a legend or a myth—but the superficial admiration of his visitor will never exalt his condition so as to hide the real deformity of his soul. Some travelers have expended their

powers of description in representing the happiness of the Polynesians when first discovered by Europeans, and in some of the least frequented isles at the present day; but these people were in fact the slaves of fear, the victims of debasing superstitions, and of demoralizing rites and customs which originated in their native Po.\*

Liberty is essential to the development of man's moral being, but there can be no liberty where the soul is debased with the bondage of fear—where the foundation of the moral life rests upon terror inspired by a belief in the power and government of Akuas,† to whom are ascribed the characters of the Polynesian divinities. The barbarian possesses a certain kind of personal independence—but for this independence he surrenders liberty of thought and freedom of the soul, which are laid down at the feet of some monstrous divinity, and sacrificed on the altar of some dark and overwhelming superstition. The influence of religious belief upon national and individual life is too powerful not to be obeyed—and hence it has come to be established as a true principle of philosophy, that a nation will be as its religious belief. History teaches it by example. The refined pagans of Rome, and Greece, and Egypt, entered their temples and offered sacrifices to gods of war, and blood, and lust, and wrong—and Roman character is written, if no where else, in the profane and abominable paintings and statuary of a Herculaneum and a Pompeii. The Polynesian nations, removed to the farther extreme, only equal in the vileness of their legends, the impurity of their lives, and the inhumanity of their offerings on the misshapen altar of a Tahitian heiau, the splendor of the sacrifices in the costly and magnificent temples of Jupiter and Minerva.

\* Night.

† Gods.

There is no picture of human life so well calculated to deceive, as that which clothes in beauty the life of "the child of nature." Some of the more recent travelers have been singular enough even at this day to renew the praises of uncivilized life—and with a superficiality of judgment as marked as their limited acquaintance with facts, have sought to present it as more desirable than the condition of a civilized being. But when viewed in the light of truth, the simplicity, and innocence, and purity, and gentleness of these artless people, gives way to the stern reality, that human nature unsanctified by the almighty power of renewing grace, is the same whether in the palmy groves of the Orient, or fanned by the spring breezes of delicious climes,—rocked into shape and expression on the bosom of the Pacific, or cherished in the sumptuous courts of Paris or Pekin, polished in the palace of the Cæsars, or rough-born on the shores of the Orange river or Gaboon. The characteristics of paganism are alike in all ages and in every place—murders, infanticide, lust, revenge, war, oppression, and wrong—summed up in the close of the first chapter of Paul to the Romans. Having "changed the truth of God into a lie," they were "filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, malice, full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity, whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents; without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful; who knowing the judgment of God, (that they which commit such things are worthy of death,) not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." This is a faithful picture of the primitive condition of the people whose history and destiny we are considering.

While we are delighted with the lovely picture of the material world around them, and the sources of physical enjoyment, an overwhelming interest attaches to the questions concerning their moral and intellectual character. The early missionaries who reached Tahiti in 1797, were very favorably impressed with the people—but a residence of a short time gave them a much better acquaintance with the dark reality, than all the gentle and winning descriptions of their predecessors.

Soon after the publication of the narratives of Cook and others, the attention of British Christians was turned to the subject of enlightening the heathen, and after the preliminaries necessary to such a step, the London Missionary Society was organized, and sent to Tahiti, the Friendly Islands, and the Marquesas, a band of missionaries. They reached Matavai Bay, March 6th, 1797, and thus was commenced the enterprise which has been productive of such marked results in that portion of the globe. The nature of the work, the character of the laborers, and the effects of their zeal and devotion, have been and ought to be the subject of frequent discussion.

In making an estimate of the benefits of civilization and Christianity in the South Seas, we are not to look at Polynesian society as it is. We are not to take the ignorant, vicious, debased, and indolent tribes—whose fathers but yesterday were engaged in bloody contests, offering human sacrifices, murdering their children, and submitting in horrible bondage to the fear of senseless and monstrous divinities, and behold in the first loosenings of these foundations of heathen life, a full exhibition of the power of the Christian religion. To expect general refinement in one age, to look for intelligence and purity of sentiment and life in the course of a single generation, would be to expect the subversion of the

laws of man's being, the performance of a miracle, or the creation of a new moral constitution.

The latest writer on Polynesia, is the author of the work named at the head of this article. This is the second narrative from his pen, *Omoo* having been preceded by "Typee: a Residence in the Marquesas." Of the author or his works we design not now to inform our readers, further than they have reference to the practical operations of the missionary enterprise in Polynesia.

We do not make an extended review of these publications because they are entitled to a serious confutation; —but regarding them as expressive of the feelings and opinions of a large class of navigators, merchants, and others, and as affording a renewed occasion for presenting facts not generally known, we have attempted an examination of their truth concerning the past and present efforts to civilize and christianize the Polynesians.

Without farther introduction, we remark generally that the testimony of Mr. Melville, were his statements consistent with fact, is sufficient to condemn the missionary work in the South Seas. The ignorance, inefficiency, and incompetency of the laborers—their interference in political affairs,—their bigotry, intolerance and inhospitality, all unite to furnish our author with matter for frequent invective, or indignant appeal.

We shall present the first thing worthy of notice in which the missionaries are introduced, and accompany Mr. Melville on his adventures as far as our space, or the patience of our readers will permit.

On page 87, in speaking of the people of the Coral or Paumotu Islands, we are told that—

"Nominally, many of these people are now Christians; and, through the political influence of their instructors, no doubt, a short time since, came under the allegiance of Pomare, the Queen of Tahiti, with which island they always carried on considerable intercourse."

When men go abroad into the world they should be prepared to observe, and when they return they should at least make themselves acquainted with their subject before they attempt to inform their countrymen. "Rope-yarn" may do very well in the forecastle, or during the hours of the night-watch, but when it is spun out in the pages of a book with reiterated protestations of correctness, and "the author's peculiar opportunities for acquiring correct information," it becomes quite another affair; and then the follies and inaccuracies of a mere romancer, otherwise unworthy of notice, require the juxtaposition of truth. There are two points in this brief passage worthy of note. 1. That the missionaries brought the islands under the Tahitian rule, and 2. The absence of any statement showing the beneficial effects of Christianity among them.

The Paumotu, Coral, or Pearl Islands, called also the Dangerous Archipelago, stretches over several degrees of latitude and longitude, crosses the meridian of Tahiti, within from five to ten degrees of longitude of the latter island. They have for a long time maintained commercial intercourse with the Society Islands, and in the reign of Pomare I, Tomatiti of the Paumotu group, attempted to overrun Tahiti.\* Pomare sent him a written letter, which led to a peace. At a period somewhat later, after Pomare II. had embraced the Christian religion, and reports of the change had reached the Coral Islands, some of the natives passed over to Tahiti to witness the wonderful revolution. When Mr. Ellis built his printing office at Afa-reaitu, Eimeo,† 1817, the body-guard of Pomare was composed of Paumotuans, in preference to his own subjects. The instructors of the simple islanders have used as little

\* Wilkes, i, 343.

† Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, ii, 165; iii, 192.

political influence in this case as in many others in which they have been compelled to play a conspicuous part.

Though Mr. Melville has much to say in many places respecting the character and labors of the missionaries, he omits here to notice the changes in the social condition of the Paumotuans, effected by the introduction of Christianity. Capt. Wilkes, who will doubtless be regarded as an impartial witness, will give us a few brief facts in illustration.

*“Nothing could be more striking than the difference that prevailed between these natives and those of the Disappointment Islands, which we had just left. The half-civilization of the natives of Raraka, was very marked, and it appeared as though we had issued out of darkness into light. They showed a modest disposition and gave us a hearty welcome. We were not long at a loss to what to ascribe it; the missionary had been at work here, and his exertions had been based upon a firm foundation; the savage had been changed to a reasonable creature.”* \* \* \* If the missionaries had effected nothing else, [the security of seamen,] they would deserve the thanks of all those who roam over this wide ocean, and incur its many unknown and hidden dangers.”

At Aurora Island, Capt. Wilkes again saw printed copies of the Scriptures, and many of the people could “read and write well.”

“No spears, clubs, or warlike instruments were to be seen, and when I asked for them as matters of curiosity, they said they had no arms except two muskets, which were pointed out to me, hanging up under the eaves of the house. The native missionary, a man about fifty years of age, told me that in times past they had ‘all war,’ but now all

was peace. I was desirous of knowing to what he imputed the change, and he readily answered, ‘Mittion-ari, mai-tai, mai-tai,’ (missionary, good, good.)”<sup>†</sup>

At Anaa or Chain Island, the like happy change was visible. The inhabitants, formerly cannibals, have become Christians, and within twenty-five years.

“Since the residence of the missionaries they have imbibed better tastes; and the Christian influence has made them more peaceful.”

The invasion of Tahiti by the French, and the Roman Priests, is made the subject of running comment through several chapters.

The intrusion of Romanists into the Hawaiian, Georgian, and Society Islands, together with the “intolerance,” “proscription,” “bigotry,” and “inhospitable treatment,” maintained towards them by the Protestant missionaries, are occasions of frequent indignation and holy repudiation with the Belcher<sup>†</sup> school, of which we may find many disciples.

The prominent principle which led to the rejection of the Romanists is obvious to a thinking mind. The half-refined idolaters see in the image of the Virgin, the crucifix, the paintings, the wafer, and the beads, only the elements of a baptized idolatry. Much as we may deplore their intellectual incapacity to discriminate here, it does not modify or change the fact. That they are not alone to be condemned for this obliquity, is evident from the history of the world.

A Hindoo Brahmin in giving his reasons for not embracing Romanism, makes the following comparisons:

<sup>†</sup> Wilkes, i, 340.

<sup>†</sup> Captain Belcher, of H. B. M. S. Sulphur, who assaulted Rev. H. Bingham by shaking his fist in his face, while the English Consul did the same to Kirau, a female, second in rank to the king. The sulphureous captain threatened to hang Mr. Bingham at the yard arm. But of this in its own time.

"Has the Feringhi cheap pardons? So have we. Can the Romanist by the mass rescue his ancestors from purgatory? We, by ceremonies at Gaya, can do the same for ours. Can the priest change the bread and wine into flesh and blood? Our muntras can impart divine attributes to images. Who are the Romish monks but the counterparts of our Sunyasees? Do the Catholics count their beads? So do we our malas. Do they pray to mother Mary? So do we to Ganga-mai. Do their priests eschew marriages? So do our Goosies. Have they nuns? So have we our back-girls, dedicated to the service of the temple. Do they boast their antiquity? Compare eighteen hundred years, the period they claim as the age of their church, with four jugs of Hindooism."

Such is the estimate placed upon the religious system of Rome by an enlightened Pagan. Does it not find a perfect parallel in the Catholic missionaries among the Indians of Green Bay, Michigan. As it is extracted from the *Seventh Report of the Leopold Foundation*,\* it comes from an undoubted source.

"The masterly painting of the cross, by Mr. J. B. Von Henepe, of Vienna, makes the altar not a little imposing. Upon two Indians who entered our church, the sight of this crucifix made so deep an impression, that they cried out, 'this is the true God whom we would serve,' and thereupon received instruction and were baptized. \* \* \*. Of beads, images, &c., we can not get enough; a beautiful rosary is no trifle for the Indians; they wear them constantly on the neck, and ask for them as unceremoniously as children."

The philosophy of the Romish church teaches that the paintings, the crucifix, &c., are only memorials or signs, to direct the spirit of the faithful to the worship of God through some object palpable to the outward sense. The same principles were held by the educated apologists of Egypt who excused the idolatry of their countrymen.

"The philosophers, say they, honored the image of God wherever they met with it, even in inanimate beings, and consequently much more in those which partook of life. They, therefore, are to be commended, who worship not the creatures, but the Supreme Deity through

them; which ought to be esteemed as so many mirrors offered us by nature, reflecting the divine image. The divine nature can not dwell in the artful disposition of colors, nor in matter which is subject to decay, and destitute both of sense and motion. As the sun, moon, air, heaven, earth, and sea are common to all men, but have different names in different nations; so there is but one mind, and one providence which governs the universe, though called by different names, and worshipped in divers manners, and with different ceremonies, according to the laws and customs of every country."—*Universal History*, vol. i, p. 597.

Idolatry, every where as well as in all its forms and modifications, has an esoteric and exoteric meaning—this is adapted to the subtle inquiry of the casuist, and that is suited to the gross and unlettered condition of the popular mind. The *masses*, both ancient and modern, were and are idolaters.

As the Tahitians and Hawaiians had long been the victims of an oppressive and bloody religious system, they rejoiced when their chains were broken; being satisfied with the religion of Christ as taught by the Protestant teachers; and delighting to worship him without the intervention of images, which appeared to them only more elegant as works of art than their own rudely hewn blocks of stone or wood, they could not consent to the reestablishing of the old idolatry under a new form. But superadded to this is another reason—laws had been enacted prohibiting the importation and sale of ardent spirits. When, therefore, the new preceptors were found on the decks of men-of-war, alternating with casks of brandy, which were to be accepted at the hazard of learning their first lesson in the classical irony of the French, the natives could not entertain any other conviction than that such a religion was no better than their ancient system.

The reader will pardon the detention occasioned by the following exquisite passage in illustration of this topic, exhibiting the parallel drawn above as seen in the history of the

\* Translated for the N. Y. Observer.

Aztec race. It is from the pen of one of the most elegant writers of the present age.

"The Roman Catholic communion has, it must be admitted, some decided advantages over the Protestant, for the purposes of proselytism. The dazzling pomp of its service, and its touching appeal to the sensibilities affect the imagination of the rude child of nature much more powerfully than the cold abstractions of Protestantism, which, addressed to the reason, demand a degree of refinement and mental culture in the audience to comprehend them. The respect, moreover, shown by the Catholics for the material representations of Divinity, greatly facilitates the same object. It is true, such representations are used by him only as incentives, not as the objects of worship. *But this distinction is lost on the savage, who finds such forms of adoration too analogous to his own to impose any great violence on his feelings.* It is only required of him to transfer his homage from the image of Quetzalcoatl, the benevolent deity who walked among men, to that of the Virgin or the Redeemer; from the cross, which he has worshiped as the emblem of the god of rain, to the same cross, the symbol of salvation."—*Prescott, Conquest of Mexico*, vol. i, p. 291.

Such, then, being the universal sentiment of idolatrous nations, which we might still farther illustrate by the history of numerous tribes, is it a matter of surprise that the Tahitians and Hawaiians, after having maintained the Protestant religion for some years, should look upon the adoption of Romanism as "a step backwards towards the ancient idolatry?" Is it strange that the chiefs should reject the Romish missionaries as being dangerous to their peace, when we remember that for similar political considerations, the ambassadors of the Leos, Piuses, and Innocents, of the papal chair were banished from Britain, Sweden, and Germany after the Reformation, and are still rejected by the Protestant princes of Europe? We leave the obvious inferences from these facts to the intelligence of the reader.\*

This view of the nature of Roman worship is well known to almost every one who visits Polynesia, where the intrusionists have sought or obtained an entrance. In the Hawaiian group, there was no opposition manifested by the chiefs, missionaries, or people, until the priests were very strongly suspected, and with good reason, to have been concerned in an attempted rebellion under Lilika. This naturally excited the jealousy of the chiefs and people against the new teachers and their religion, regarding them as equally dangerous to the maintenance of government, the administration of wholesome laws, and the preservation of good order. Without referring to the testimony of the missionaries, which might be condemned as the evidence of interested parties, we give a brief passage from Capt. Wilkes's Narrative:—

Middleton on the 'Conformity of Popery and Paganism.' And in passing to the next topic must place in connection with the above the following circumstances.

"The inhabitants of the isles of Peten—to return from our digression—listened attentively to the preaching of the Franciscan Friars, and consented to the instant demolition of their idols, and the erection of the cross upon their ruins. A singular circumstance showed the value of these hurried conversions. Cortés, on his departure, left among this friendly people one of his horses, who had been disabled by an injury in the foot. The Indians felt a reverence for the animal, as in some way connected with the mysterious power of the white men. When their visitors had gone, they offered flowers to the horse, and, as it is said, prepared for him many savory messes of poultry, such as they would have administered to their own sick. Under this extraordinary diet the poor animal pined away and died. The affrighted Indians raised his effigy in stone, and, placing it in one of their *teocallis*, did homage to it, as to a deity. In 1618, when two Franciscan Friars came to preach the Gospel in these regions, then scarcely better known to the Spaniards than before the time of Cortés, one of the most remarkable objects which they found was this statue of a horse, receiving the homage of the Indian worshipers, as the god of thunder and lightning."—*Prescott, Conquest of Mexico*, vol. iii, p. 294.

\* The curious student of such themes, whether Romanist or Protestant, we refer to the analytical dissertation of Conyers

"In spite of the prohibitory law, [an early statute forbidding the introduction of any but the Protestant religion,] it is a notorious and indisputable fact, that the first Catholic priests, who landed in 1827, were kindly treated by all classes of natives, and by the Protestant missionaries. The American mission even furnished them with the books they had printed to enable them to learn the Hawaiian language. When, however, mass was first publicly celebrated, the converted natives in general took an aversion to that mode of worship, *as it appeared to them a step backward towards their ancient idolatry*; and the very circumstance which, had they continued heathen, might have been an inducement to adopt, served now to alienate them from it."\*

This estimate of the Romish worship, by the half-civilized, and half-enlightened people of the Hawaii Islands, is announced again in the "Manifesto" of Captain La Place, who plays such a conspicuous part in the history of the group. He says—

"In fine, they [the principal chiefs] will comprehend, that to persecute the Catholic religion, to tarnish it with the name of idolatry, and to expel, under this absurd pretext, the French from this Archipelago, was to offer an insult to France, and to its sovereign."—*Wilkes*, vol. iv, p. 501, *Appendix*, 1.

It might be a matter of some interest to an enlightened statesman to inquire, to what extent French captains have the privilege of invading the rights of Americans abroad, of dishonoring the flag of the United States, and menacing the lives of those under its protection. Beside the flagrant outrages of La Place, in the transactions in which he figured, occurrences still more recent, in the Gaboon river, demand the serious attention of the American people. If the French government and its officers present themselves to the world as the agents in forcing rum and Romanism on the less refined nations of the earth, it may not be

unimportant to the American people to know how far their rights are to be invaded in the persons of their fellow citizens who exile themselves in the noblest of all human enterprises.

Passing over many pages which are full of statements calculated to mislead, we reach chapter xlviii, entitled, "Tahiti as it is." Let us look at it.

"Of the results which have flowed from the intercourse of foreigners with Polynesians, including the attempts to civilize and christianize them by missionaries, Tahiti, on many accounts, is obviously the fairest practical example. Indeed, it may now be asserted, that the experiment of christianizing the Tahitians, and improving their social condition by the introduction of foreign custom, has been fully tried. The present generation have grown up under the auspices of their religious instructors. And although it may be urged that the labors of the latter have at times been more or less obstructed by unprincipled foreigners, still, this in no wise renders Tahiti any the less a fair illustration; for, with obstacles like these, the missionaries in Polynesia must always, and every where struggle."

It has sometimes been a question with us, whether the presence of foreigners does not do almost as much injury to the Polynesians, as all the good accomplished by the missionaries. How this influence of foreigners has been exerted, may be seen in the fact that they have retarded improvement, procured the murder of missionaries, and sought to have the mission establishments broken up. From a crowd of facts, we cite only a few.

The directors of the London Missionary Society, sensible of the necessity of a regular system of industry, to the maintenance of a rank among civilized and Christian nations, took measures to introduce the sugar manufacture on the islands, some eight or ten species of cane being indigenous. For this purpose they sent out machinery, and a gentleman who had long been acquainted with the processes adopted in the West Indies. Look at the sequel.

\* *Wilkes*, Exploring Expedition, vol. iv, p. 11. See also Letter of Kamehameha III. to P. A. Brinamode, U. S. Commercial Agent, *ibid*, vol. iv, p. 505. *Jarvis's History of Sandwich Islands*, App., p. 394.

"Early in the year 1819, the captain of a vessel, the *Indus*, whom purposes of commerce led to Tahiti, informed the king that Mr. Gyles's errand to Tahiti was merely experimental, and that, should the attempt to manufacture sugar succeed, individuals from distant countries, possessing influence and large resources, would establish themselves in the islands, and with an armed force, which he would in vain attempt to oppose, would either destroy the inhabitants, or reduce them to slavery. These alarming statements were strengthened by allusion to the present state of the West Indies, where Mr. Gyles had been engaged in the manufacture of sugar and the culture of coffee. \* \* \* This view of the enterprise led Pomare to decline rendering that assistance which was expected, and the want of which retarded the progress of the work. The necessary labor required from the natives was paid for at a remarkably high price, and often difficult to obtain on any terms."

The result was, that the missionaries, under these circumstances, and the unfounded rumors thus brought against them, finding they could not succeed, abandoned the undertaking, and on the 14th of May, "to satisfy the king, and quiet the people, advised Mr. Gyles to return to New South Wales by the first conveyance."

The same difficulties were encountered in the introduction of cotton manufacture, alluded to by Mr. Melville, p. 258. The traders assured the people that it would be injurious to the interests of the islands, would prevent shipping from visiting them, &c. ; offering to give for raw cotton twice as much cloth as they could procure at the factory. Sometimes they endeavored to persuade Mr. Armitage to abandon so hopeless a project as to train the people to habits of industry.†

At the Sandwich Islands, the missionaries who landed March 3d, 1820, were greeted with similar difficulties. Unprincipled foreigners assured Libolihi that the missionaries would eventually strive to obtain possession of the islands—that

though the foreigners first went to the West India Islands in a peaceable manner, they afterwards attacked and defeated the inhabitants, hunted them with blood-hounds, and remained masters of the islands. § After some time, however, these reports were so far overcome, that the missionaries were welcomed, and assigned to different stations.

Without stopping to quote Wilkes's *Narrative* and the records of the *Missionary Society*, or the *Missionary Herald*, we take another example occurring at the Tonga Islands.

The missionaries who settled at Tongataboo, from the Duff, April 12, 1797, were exposed to great danger from the savage conduct and continual warfare of the people. A convict from Botany Bay, named Morgan, came to settle on the island ; he made himself obnoxious to the body by his stealing and improper conduct, when they complained to the chiefs. Morgan retorted that the missionaries were the cause of the pestilence then raging, that they shut themselves up to pray and sing, which was their way of sorcery, that their books were books of witchcraft, &c. He told the chiefs, "You are dying every day, and will soon be cut off, and the King of England will take possession of your islands." The chiefs rushed upon the missionaries and killed a number, while the others escaped to Port Jackson.||

The desolating effects of the licentious intercourse of the foreigners and natives threatening to exterminate the race, a law was passed by the Hawaiian government for its suppression. The missionaries were charged with the creation of this law, which produced the most violent opposition among the seamen frequenting the various ports of

§ Ellis, ii, 212. *History of Missions*, 2 vols. 4to, "Sandwich Islands." Dibble, *Hist. Sandwich Islands*, p. 72. Jarvis's *Hist. Sandwich Islands*, 221. Ellis, iv, 31. Stewart, *Private Journal*, p. 157.

|| *Mariner's Tonga Islands*, p. 74; *Missionary Voyage*, 8vo, 1805, 342, 43.

\* Ellis, ii, 212, 213. † *Ibid*, ii, 213.  
† *Ibid*, ii, 224.

that group. On the 5th October, 1826, soon after its passage, two of the crew of the ship Daniel, Captain Buckle, of London, called at the house of the missionaries, and charged them with, being the authors of the law, and threatening them with a combined attack. The lawless behavior of the crew of this vessel, their desperation, the violence of their threats, and the visits they made to the house, compelled the teachers to barricade their house, from which they were afraid to stir for some time. Captain Buckle offered his men muskets and ammunition for the attack on the missionary dwellings.\*

Still more infamous than this was the conduct of Lieut. John Percival, and the crew of the U. S. schooner *Dolphin*, Honolulu, 1826. For the details of their proceedings reference may be had to several sources.†

Such has been the influence of foreigners, and could the long catalogue of fearful crime be known, the people of Britain and America might well weep over their shame.

The external forms of heathen society, and the institutions which characterize its history, together with the more hideous crimes which darken its page, are overthrown with comparative ease, by the force of Christian truth, and the example of civilization witnessed in its teachers, but having achieved this, the missionary has a far more critical and prolonged task to perform. He must take the most difficult materials and shape them into order, and if possible, mould them into a divine image. He must take the human soul and emancipate it from the bondage of fear—he must take the most utterly depraved heart and cleanse it in the Siloam pools of life—he must take the mind, dark as the Po, to which it looks forward

without a ray, and shed upon it a beam of holy light—he must take the savage nature of the lion and the hyena, and transform it to the similitude of the lamb and the dove—he must accomplish that which all the proud philosophy of man, the lofty creations of genius, and the humanizing influences of civilization can not effect—present it, a lovely adumbration of the Deity, at the foot of the Redeemer. The magnitude of this work can be really appreciated only by those who undertake its accomplishment.

The state of morals in the South Sea Islands, during the reign of paganism, may be learned from the following graphic account of what occurred on the death of Moomdoe, the king of the Tonga Islands.

"As the funeral was to take place to-day, [May 2, 1797,] brother Bowell went with Ambler to Bunghys to see the ceremony, and found about four thousand persons sitting round the place where the fiaooka stands. A few minutes after our arrival, we heard a great shouting and blowing of conch shells at a small distance; soon after about an hundred men appeared, armed with clubs and spears, and rushing into the area, began to cut and mangle themselves in a most dreadful manner: many struck their heads violently with their clubs; and the blows, which might be heard thirty or forty yards off, they repeated till the blood ran down in streams. Others who had spears, thrust them through their thighs, arms, and cheeks, all the while calling on the deceased in a most affecting manner. A native of Feejee, who had been a servant of the deceased, appeared quite frantic; he entered the area with fire in his hand, and having previously oiled his hair, set it on fire, and ran about with it all on flame. When they had satisfied themselves with this manner of torment, they sat down, beat their faces with their fists, and then retired. A second party went through the same cruelties; and after them a third entered, shouting and blowing the shells: four of the foremost held stones which they used to knock out their teeth; those who blew the shells cut their heads with them in a shocking manner. A man that had a spear, run it through his arm just above the elbow, and with it sticking fast run about the area for some time. Another, who seemed to be a principal chief, acted as if quite bereft of his senses; he ran to every corner of the area,

\* Journal of Rev. Mr. Richards. See Hist. of Missions, vol. ii, p. 325.

† Tracy's Hist. of Missions, p. 184; Jarvis's Hawaiian Islands, p. 263.

and at each station beat his head with a club till the blood flowed down his shoulders. After this, brother Bowell, shocked, and unable to bear the scene any longer, returned home. Fatafaihe also came to our dwelling, and staid about two hours. At two o'clock in the afternoon four of us went to the fiaooka, where the natives, of both sexes, were still at the dreadful work of cutting and mangling themselves.\*\*

Mariner, who resided several years at Tongatabu, was present at the death of Finou Toogahau, the successor of Moomooe, and witnessed the funeral ceremonies. Besides scenes similar to those above described, he informs us that some cut their heads with such strong and frequent blows, that they caused themselves to reel, producing afterwards a temporary insanity. It is difficult to say to what length this extravagance would have been carried, if the prince had not ordered Mr. Mariner to go and take the club away from them. "It is customary on such occasions, when a man takes a club from another, to use it on himself; but being a foreigner, Mr. Mariner was not expected to do this." The fishermen of the late prince came up, each bearing a paddle with which he beat his head. They were singular in another respect: that is, they had three arrows stuck through their cheeks, in a slanting direction, so that while their points came quite through the cheek and met in the mouth, the other ends went over their shoulders, and were kept in that situation by another arrow, the points of which were tied to the end of either arrow, passing over the shoulder. With this horrible equipment, they passed around the grave, beating their faces and heads, or pinching up the skin of the breast, and running a spear quite through it.†

In view of such evidences of the moral condition of the Polynesians,

it is not to be expected that their conception of the Christian religion could be either very clear, or, dim and gross at best, could be very soon directed towards the spiritual doctrines of the Gospel. With what courage must those men and women have been nerved, and with what faith strengthened, who could look on such a pandemonium of savage emotion, and almost infernal passion, and resolve to lead these same individuals, gentle and subdued, to the foot of the cross.

The contagious nature, if we may use the term, of some of the awakenings among the Polynesians, might reasonably be anticipated when reasoning upon such scenes as those above rehearsed. That all should have an earnest appreciation and genuine experience of divine love, is asking too much under the circumstances, but that the large majority have some inward light, may be believed. Partial, indeed, it may be, but day is ushered in by the faintest change in the impending gloom, which gradually disappears before the unclouded sun.

Such a scene as that described by Mr. Melville, with the difference that in neither case was it occasioned by a desire to obtain favor with the missionaries, was witnessed in 1840, at Pago pago, Tutuila, Samoa or Navigator's Islands. The awakening there is described at considerable length in the proper journals. The following is the testimony of the witnesses.

Mr. Murray, the missionary, had preached but a few minutes,

"When the house seemed to shake, and the Spirit to dart his arrows of conviction with such a powerful hand, that the whole place was on the move. Women were carried out by dozens, convulsed and struggling, so as to drive five or six men about like trees in the wind, who were exerting all their strength to hold and convey them away. I had heard of beating breasts and tearing hair before, but I have now seen and shall not soon forget it. The weaker sex was not alone affected; many men were carried

\* Missionary Voyage, London, 4to, 1799, p. 237.

† Mariner, Tonga Islands, vol. i, p. 398.

out lifeless as stones, and many could scarcely be removed because of their awfully convulsive struggles."

Similar scenes of extravagance have been often witnessed among rude and uncultivated people, and even in our own country. Nor does such excitement prove the absence of some intelligent conviction of sin, and the renewing operations of the Holy Spirit. The fact recorded of this revival, that it was followed by the happiest reformations among thieves and polygamists, is a sufficient answer to the cavils of such writers as Melville.

The reader will see, in the moral and intellectual character of the Polynesians, the gigantic labors which must be undertaken and the severe trials which must be endured, on the part of the Christian missionary. Is it not enough that he should be exposed to the ferocity of savages, and be buried in such a mass of corrupt and loathsome materials, without being vilified in his native land by the misrepresentations and detraction of his own countrymen?

We all know the power of association, and have doubtless felt its influence in our own experience. How strong must this power be in retarding the development of spiritual religion among a people like the Polynesians, where the scenes of their former superstitions and crimes are still marked by the ruins of a bloody altar or a crumbling heiau, and where many of the present inhabitants participated in the abominations and cruel rites of paganism. While no one can be so irrational as to look for a genuine experience of religion in every individual, the surrounding grossness must be a serious obstacle to the advancement of those who profess the Christian name. Convert a heathen and leave him in the midst of his old idolatries and unholy associations—

\* *Missionary Life in Samoa; or Life of George Archibald Lumlie.* New York: R. Carter. Page 127, 128, *et seq.*

tions—expose him still to the allurements of licentious dances and games—tempt him with the lawless independence of his former condition, in place of the restraints and self-denial of Christianity—and it will be a miracle if he preserves his integrity. But if in addition to these temptations, visitors from civilized nations conspire to undermine his faith and virtue, and Tommos and Long Ghosts play their insidious words into the ears of the Ideas and Loos of such communities, and with refined "hypocrisy," "devoutly clasp their hands and implore a blessing,"<sup>f</sup> the day may be long postponed before pure religion will become established in those lovely isles.

Like all superficial writers, Mr. Melville leaves the greater part of his task unperformed. He does not allude to the former degradation of the female population, with its many consequent evils. But with a partiality quite characteristic, he quotes Kotzebue and Beechey in support of his positions. The first, though uttering in almost every page a host of misstatements, gives us the following information, after speaking of the reform in the thieving propensity of the Tahitians.

"Neither can I deny that the morals of the Tahitians were very exceptionable in another point, in which also the influence of the missionaries has been beneficially exerted."

The same author says:

"After many fruitless efforts, some English missionaries succeeded at length in the year 1797, in introducing what they called Christianity into Tahiti, and even in gaining over to their doctrine the king Tajo, who then governed the whole island in peace and tranquillity. This conversion was a spark thrown into a pow-

<sup>f</sup> *Omoo*, p. 348. "Hereupon, every body present looked exceedingly pleased; Po-Po coming up, and addressing the doctor [Long Ghost], with much warmth; and Arfretree, regarding him with almost maternal affection, exclaimed delightedly, 'Ah! mickonaree tata maitai!' in other words, 'What a pious young man!'"

der magazine, and was followed by a dreadful explosion. The marais were suddenly destroyed by order of the king—every memorial of the former worship defaced—the new religion forcibly established, and whoever would not adopt it, put to death. With the zeal for making proselytes, the rage of tigers took possession of a people once so gentle. Streams of blood flowed—whole races were exterminated.” “The religion taught by the missionaries is not true Christianity, though it may possibly comprehend some of its doctrines, but half understood by the teachers themselves. That it was established by force, is of itself an evidence against its Christian principle. A religion which consists in the eternal repetition of prescribed prayers, which forbids every innocent pleasure, and cramps or annihilates every mental power, is a libel on the Divine Founder of Christianity, the benign Friend of human kind.”<sup>1</sup>

Our Russian navigator proceeds to use the language quoted by Mr. Melville, that “with some good, religion has done a great amount of evil. It has restrained the vices of theft and incontinence, but it has given birth to ignorance, hypocrisy, and a hatred and contempt of all other modes of faith once foreign to the open and benevolent character of the Tahitian!” Christianity, which found the Tahitians without a written language, and in twenty years gave them the Bible, and books of scientific and literary character, “gave birth to *ignorance*!” Christianity, which found the Tahitians treacherous, like all other unrefined nations who have no moral sense, “gave birth to *hypocrisy*,” which is a universal trait of the human heart when left free to develop its depravity! Christianity gave birth to *intolerance*, when the truth is that since the introduction of the Gospel, the liberality of the people is in delightful contrast with the ferocious wars of their former state! Christianity put to death the hapless victims of its savage power, when the record is in all Polynesia, with only one exception, that the clemency and tenderness of the Christians

after the battles waged by the exasperated heathen, gave convincing evidence of the truth and loveliness of the new religion!

On page 231, says Mr. Melville—

“The entire system of idolatry has been done away, together with several barbarous practices engrafted thereon. But this result is not so much to be ascribed to the missionaries, as to the civilizing effects of a long and constant intercourse with the whites of all nations; to whom, for many years, Tahiti has been one of the principal places of resort in the South Seas. At the Sandwich Islands, the potent institution of the Tabu, together with the entire paganism of the land, was utterly abolished by a voluntary act of the natives, some time previous to the arrival of the first missionaries among them.”

We have no desire to disparage the “civilizing effects of a long and constant intercourse with whites of all nations,”—what they were we cheerfully leave our author to define. So far as all reliable history sheds light on the question, the only civilization that Pomare I. and II. and their chiefs learned was the use of firearms and distilled spirits, instead of the disgusting *Ava*—until 1812, when Pomare II., during his expatriation from Tahiti, professed Christianity.

The great temple of Oro was in the district of Atehuru, Tahiti, and in 1801, a great council having been held, Otu and his father pretended to receive communication from heaven that Oro wished to be conveyed to Tautira, in Taiarabu, and on resistance of the Atehuruan chiefs, a great conflict ensued. The animosities continued with various successes for several years, when in 1808 Pomare fled to Eimeo, and those of the missionaries who remained behind him left on 22d December, 1809. During the exile of Pomare his thoughts were turned to Christianity, and on the 18th July, 1812, he professed the Christian religion. In 1814 he was invited to return to Tahiti, and after a time thought himself and his Christian

\* *Kotzebus*, 2 vols. 8vo, London, vol. i, 159.

† *Ibid*, i, 168.

subjects secure. The heathen party, however, sought to destroy them in a great battle on the 7th of July, 1815, but the Christians anticipating an attack were all prepared to embark, and escaped in their canoes to Eimeo. The heathen party finding themselves foiled, in order to revenge themselves for old quarrels, fell into a bloody contest on the spot, when Pomare was soon after recalled by the conquerors. On the 12th of November, 1815, the last battle which stained Tahitian soil with heathen sacrifices took place, and Pomare was acknowledged undisturbed sovereign. The overthrow of idolatry immediately consequent on his accession, was the direct result of missionary labor. And so in every instance, with the exception of the Sandwich Islands alone.

Our author betrays another evidence of ignorance by saying, page 267, that the cocoa-nut and bread-fruit trees were destroyed "in the sanguinary religious hostilities which ensued upon the conversion to Christianity of the first Pomare." The hostility was on the side of the heathen, who endeavored to destroy the Christians, and these girdled groves of bread-fruit are the sad evidences of the desolation which marked heathen warfare.

After Pomare had routed the rebels on the 12th of November, they took themselves to the mountains and caves, expecting to be pursued and put to death—their children slaughtered, their houses burnt to the ground, and their trees destroyed. But the stragglers after two or three days ventured to peep out, and finding every thing around them in peace, emboldened by their security, came out of their hiding places, and were met by assurances of protection. They could not believe their eyes and ears at what they saw and heard, but when they found that their families were safe, and their fruit trees uninjured, and that nothing but the great idol and the

false gods and temples were destroyed, they marched out in a body and submitted to Pomare, crying out, that the new religion alone could have produced this change. After this event, commenced those improvements which have resulted in making Tahiti a place where whites of all nations can resort.

This destruction of the groves of bread-fruit and cocoa-nut trees was one of the most deplorable features of heathen warfare. The people, as well as the chiefs, often spoke of it in allusion to the blessings of Christianity. Said one of the chiefs of Raratonga, to Mr. Williams—

"We were fools enough to fight with the trees as well as with men; since we cut many down ourselves, lest our enemies should eat the fruit of them; and others our conquerors destroyed. If it were possible I would put new bark on all these trees, and fill up the gashes in all the others; for, wherever I go, they stare me in the face, and remind me of my defeat. However, young trees are growing fast, and I am planting cocoa-nuts in all directions; so that my possessions will be equally valuable with those of our conquerors; and I am under no apprehension of having them again destroyed; for the Gospel has put an end to our wars."

These struggles, often resulting in the depopulation of whole districts, were frequent before the introduction of Christianity—but wherever the Gospel has been established, *wars have ceased*. Mauke, the island visited by Lord Byron, is another instance of the change. Two or three years before the teachers landed there, Ramo-tane, the chief of Atiu, one of the Hervey Group, in order to extend his dominions, passed over to Mauke, and destroyed the people, set fire to the houses containing the sick, and seizing those who attempted to escape, tossed them upon fires kindled for the purpose! Occasional famines and these horrible contests were leading motives for the infanticide so prevalent in Polynesia. It was indeed a spectacle morally sublime in the highest degree, that this same Ramo-tane, the murderous chieftain, himself be-

came the first bearer of the words of Christ to the people of Mauke, after his conversion, and was one of the first company who united in that lovely isle, in celebrating the dying love of the Prince of Peace. While civilization has not yet taught the two greatest nations of the world to beat their swords and spears into ploughs and pruning-hooks, the ferocious and sanguinary idolater has learned the lessons of infinite love, and weeps over the desolation he has occasioned—"to learn war no more."

After the subversion of idolatry in the Georgian and Society groups, Kamehameha I, of Hawaii (Sandwich Islands), becoming acquainted with the advantages of Christianity, began to inquire what the new religion was. He however died on the 8th of May, 1819, eleven months before the American missionaries touched at Kailua. Liholiho, (not only unprincipled, but the victim of the base arts of foreigners, who made him drunk, and wrote "on paper and taught Kuakini the vilest words in the English language, and engaged in mock prayer before him,"\*) feeling the restraint which the tabut imposed upon his women, resolved on its overthrow. This step being favored by the chiefs and others, he prepared a feast, and deliberately taking a forbidden dish, went over to the table with the women and partook of the repast. The cry went round, "the kapu is broken," and soon after the gloomy and bloody edifice of idolatry toppled to its ruin. The "long and civilizing intercourse with foreigners" had nearly defeated the Sandwich Island mission, had not providential circumstances prevented the success of perfidious and aggrandizing schemes of interested parties, whose cupidity or whose licentious propensities they

knew would be crossed by the presence of missionaries.

Mr. Melville continues—

"But let us consider what results are directly ascribable to the missionaries alone.

"In all cases, they have striven hard to mitigate the evils resulting from the commerce with the whites in general. Such attempts, however, have been injudicious and often ineffectual; in truth, a barrier almost insurmountable is presented in the dispositions of the people themselves. Still, in this respect, the morality of the Islanders is, upon the whole, improved by the presence of missionaries.

"But the greatest achievement of the latter, and one which in itself is most hopeful and gratifying is, that they have translated the entire Bible into the language of the island; and I have myself known several who were able to read it with facility. They have also established churches, and schools for both children and adults; the latter, I regret to say, are now much neglected, which must be ascribed, in a great measure, to the disorders growing out of the proceedings of the French."

What the evils resulting from the "commerce with the whites" can be, the reader has no means of knowing from Mr. Melville, unless the abolition of idolatry, in consequence of the "long and civilizing intercourse with foreigners," be the leading feature. We presume, however, from what little we know of the subject, that the evil, so definitely hinted at, is the wholesale prostitution, in consequence of which the Tahitians and the Hawaiians have been swept off by a terrific scourge since their intercourse with the whites commenced, and which has been only stayed, and the hope of saving a remnant of these people fostered, by the establishing of Christian laws and Christian institutions. The "evils," which perhaps might be regarded as the chaffering and swindling operations of foreigners, are too momentous and significant to be passed over without a word. And yet this profound oracle of Polynesia and "Tabiti as it is," says nothing in reference to it, except that "the morality of the islanders, is, upon the whole, improved by the missiona-

\* Jarvis's Hist. Hawaiian Islands. 241; Stewart's Private Journal; pp. 231, 232.

† Hawaiian, *kapu*.

ries." The "injudicious and intellectual attempts" are nothing but the enactment of laws prohibiting licentiousness, the importation of liquors, and intemperance!!

The true condition of a heathen tribe, in all the moral deformity and hideousness of their abominable and cruel rites, and the almost utter negation of every thing that is *good*, in the intelligent use of the term, and not mere instinct, can be appreciated only by those who have undertaken as missionaries to enlighten and elevate them. And although we may now go to Tahiti, and behold in it, as well as in other parts of the world, the broken fragments and dreary ruins of the old systems, and all things as in the transition state; and though we may weep over the fate of tens of thousands, we have yet reason to hope that the seed sown, will at length make her rejoice in brightness and beauty.

When Pomare, on the 30th of June, 1817, printed the first sheet of the spelling book, he was but giving the first impetus to that untold power which is to be the chief agent in the emancipation of the world. And though we may have our ears pained by the discord, and our hearts broken with grief over the wasting families of the earth, we feel cheered with the thought that there is a power which shall stem the torrent of death, or will call to judgment the guilty destroyers and their less guilty victims.

The remaining remarks of our author are fortified with quotations from Kotzebue, Beechey, and others, and are such as favor Mr. Melville's views. However agreeable it might be to expose the follies of this whole triad of superficial observers, the time and space requisite would make too large a demand upon the patience of our readers. A full examination of the legitimate topics of this discussion, the improvement in the intellectual, moral, and social condition of the Polynesians—their for-

mer customs and habits, the present state of society in regard to its industrial interests, the introduction of various branches of art, manufacture, and agriculture, the establishing of codes of written laws, the recognizing of these governments as independent sovereignties, the fearful depopulation of the islands, and others which crowd before us, would protract our remarks to an ample folio. But we forbear the arduous task.

The opinions of men who after a few days of intercourse with a people whom they see for the first time, and to whom they bid farewell in a week or a month, whether they be titled noblemen or frolicking seamen, Von Kotzebues, Beecheyes, or Melvilles, are all of little moment; yet, as Russell remarks of the first two, their opinions are such "as can not fail to have great weight with the public," because their position entitles them, as observers and historians, to credit, not that they make statements which are reliable or true.

Passing by Lieut. Wilkes's Exploring Expedition, we content ourselves with a single passage from Darwin's "Voyage of a Naturalist," the modesty of whose opinions, with the enlightened character of the observer, strongly commends it to the impartial reader.

"From the varying accounts which I had had before reaching these islands, I was very anxious to form, from my own observation, a judgment of their moral state, although such judgment would necessarily be very imperfect. First impressions at all times very much depend on one's previously acquired ideas. My notions were drawn from Ellis's Polynesian Researches, an admirable and most interesting work, but naturally looking at every thing under a favorable point of view; from Beechey's Voyage, and from that of Kotzebue, which is strongly adverse to the whole missionary system. He who compares these three accounts will, I think, form a tolerably correct conception of the present state of Tahiti. One of my impressions, which I took from the two last authorities, was decidedly incorrect, viz. that the Tahitians

had become a gloomy race, and lived in fear of the missionaries. Of the latter feeling I saw no trace, unless, indeed, fear and respect be confounded under one name. Instead of discontent being a common feeling, it would be difficult in Europe to pick out of a crowd half so many merry and happy faces. The prohibition of the flute and dancing is inveighed against as wrong and foolish; the more than Presbyterian manner of keeping the Sabbath, is looked at in a similar light. On these points I will not pretend to offer any opinion in opposition to men who have resided as many years as I have days on the island.

"On the whole, it appears to me that the morality and religion of the inhabitants are highly creditable. There are many who attack, even more acrimoniously than Kotzebue, both the missionaries, their system, and the effects produced by it. Such reasoners never compare the present state with that of the island only twenty years ago, nor even with that of Europe at the present day; but they compare it with the high standard of Gospel perfection. They expect the missionaries to effect that which the Apostles themselves failed to do. Inasmuch as the condition of the people falls short of this high standard, blame is attached to the missionary, instead of credit for that which he has effected. They forget, or will not remember, that human sacrifices and the power of an idolatrous priesthood—a system of profligacy unparalleled in any other part of the world—infanticide, a consequence of that system—bloody wars, where the conquerors spared neither women nor children—that all these have been abolished, and that dishonesty, intemperance, and licentiousness, have been greatly reduced by the introduction of Christianity. In a voyager to forget these things is base ingratitude, for should he chance to be at the point of shipwreck on some unknown coast, he will most devoutly pray that the influence of the missionary may have extended thus far.

"In point of morality, the virtue of the women, it has been often said, is most open to exception. But, before they are blamed too severely, it will be well distinctly to call to mind the scenes described by Captain Cook and Mr. Banks, in which the grandmothers and mothers of the present race took part. Those who are most severe should consider how much of the morality of women in Europe is owing to the system early impressed by mothers on their daughters, and how much in each individual case to the precepts of religion. But it is useless to argue with such reasoners: I believe that, disappointed in not finding the field of licentiousness quite so open as formerly, they will not give credit to a morality

which they do not wish to practice, or to a religion which they undervalue, if not despise."<sup>\*</sup>

The unfinished records of the love scenes of our modern Boccaccio, which leave the reader in a state of not very uncertain surmise as to the secret incidents, we commend to the conscience of their author in connection with the foregoing passage.

When we review the condition of the South Sea islanders in all its essential features, mistaken as some of the missionaries have been in the measures they have adopted, engaged in a novel and almost untried enterprise, working upon materials the most repulsive and difficult, attempting to overturn the superstitions and systems of ages, breaking up the stubborn and rugged soil, and endeavoring to soften and purify the callous and unclean hearts of some of the most debased of all the children of our common Father, we think there is ground for the belief that very much has been done towards their regeneration and redemption. In our own civilized and Christian land, how many are there who present no better aspects of moral character than the half-reclaimed Tahitian or Hawaiian! Our refinement only conceals and hides in secret places the moral death—the loathsome and putrid carcass—that preys upon hundreds of thousands at our very firesides, and at the thresholds of our sanctuaries. The intellectual grossness of the Polynesian, the merely animal instinct by which he had been, until recently, governed, forms the unsightly background upon which his moral condition has been drawn. To look for a high state of cultivation, or even a proximate understanding of the spiritual nature of Christianity, in a single age, would be to require more than the civilized

\* Darwin's Voyage of a Naturalist, (Harper's New Miscellany,) vol ii, p. 191-193.

world, with all its refinement and its intelligence, now gives to the religion of the Redeemer. Is the evangelized Tahitian or Hawaiian, to be accounted a barbarian still, unless he yield a purer homage in one generation, than has the Christian world with the light and privileges of eighteen centuries?

THE WORK HAS BEEN NOBLY BEGUN. Wherever the missionary has been, the mariner may follow in peace and security: where the mariner went first, the missionary could enter only at some serious risk. Where the missionary succeeded, a code of laws and a settled constitutional government have been established: where the mariner first landed, all was left to the caprice or the cupidity of the chiefs or the foreigners. Where the missionaries first settled, morality and the arts were

introduced: where the mariner resorted, the wildest licentiousness was encouraged. Where ignorance brooded over the nations, the missionaries have poured abroad a flood of holy light and intelligence. The war-club and spear have given place to deeds of love and peace. The bread-fruit and the cocoa-nut, once destroyed, now rear their heads over peaceful vales and undisturbed hamlets.

Honor, then, to those noble men who, burning with zeal to rescue the heathen from temporal and spiritual death, left their homes and their enjoyments, to teach them the way of peace, and

“ High on the pagan hills, where Satan sat  
Encamped, and o'er the subject kingdoms  
threw  
Perpetual night, to plant Immanuel's cross,  
‘The ensign of the Gospel blazing round  
Immortal truth.’ ”

#### VOICES OF FREEDOM.\*

We have noticed with no little satisfaction for some time past, that while far the greater part of the current light literature of the day, is either positively pernicious in its influence, or is utterly insipid and useless, except to procure waste of time and want of thought, there is yet another very considerable portion coming into existence, which has a purer aim than to corrupt and destroy, and a more exalted one, than merely to relieve the tedium of an idle hour. It seems to have been discovered at last, that men can be amused and instructed at the same time; that their passions and emotions can be aroused, and yet not vent themselves in knighthood, nor misanthropy, nor libertinism. It is gratifying to find that in some instances, the flowery walks of literature have been trodden by

earnest and thinking men, whose object has been, not simply to weave garlands for sentimental maidens, whose nervous systems are shockingly out of tune, that the sickening perfume of the flowers breathed late at night in the lorn sufferers' close-pent chambers, may aggravate their amiable illness; but rather to gather out from the whole kingdom of nature, whatever is best fitted to heal the diseased, and to supply additional strength and sustenance to those who are already strong to bear the burdens and to meet the conflicts of man's life. And they who, thus intent upon ministering healing and strength to diseased humanity, have sought through the many and diversified fields of nature, that great garden of God's planting, have found there many a tree of knowledge, the fruit of which is not forbidden, though it be beautiful to the eye and pleasant to the taste, and to

\* Voices of Freedom; by J. G. Whittier. Fourth edition. 1846.

be desired to make one wise. They have shown, and are still showing, by their productions, that not every voice of inviting melody is to be shut out from our ears at first sound, as if its very enchantment must prove it to be that of a syren, which delights and allure only to destroy. They have taught us, that not every form of beauty should warn us at first sight, to turn from beholding, as if its captivating aspect were enough of itself to prove it to be some Circean monster, which changes all who expose themselves to the influence of its magic spells, to loathsome brutes. The stern philosophy which would make truth necessarily repulsive to all not disposed to obey its dictates, has been obliged to admit as much at least as this, that if perverse and corrupting principles may find their way to the heart, under the fascinating disguise of a beautiful exterior, the maxims of sound wisdom may reach the same fountain of feeling and of action, under the same disguise. And if it be denied that there is any thing good in the disguise in the one instance, it must be admitted that there need be nothing evil in it, in the second. If a subtle and deadly poison may be administered unperceived, in a draught so pleasant as that all appetites will relish its sweetness; so the antidote which the diseased may regard as loathsome in itself, may be given in the same form. If the child, trained up in circumstances adverse to his moral improvement, under the constant influence of those who are bitterly hostile to all good, may become gradually worse and worse, till at length he knows so little of what good is, as to be insensible of the extent to which evil reigns in every desire of his soul; so, under the influence of a different training, may another become far more deeply in love with all goodness than he is aware, till rough contact with the world reveals to himself more clear-

ly the governing principles of his own mind. And the means which shall contribute to this happy result in the one case, and this unhappy one in the other, may not be parental example and instruction alone. If a bad book, drawn up in a fascinating style, both of language and of conception, may do its reader more harm than he is aware, so a good book with the same pleasing address, may do its reader more good than he is aware. It is well that some are beginning to see this. And when they attempt to set forth truth, adorned with the gorgeous colors which imagination showers upon its own creation, and the cautious critic insinuates that there must be an insidious poison lurking beneath so much beauty; they may well dare to say of their own, and similar productions, as the shrewd John Wesley said in defense of himself, for having employed some of the gayer airs of the festive hall, to set forth the raptures of religious emotion—"It is a pity that the devil should have all the best music." It is also a pity, that the devil should have all the best literature. It is a most mournful pity, in the estimation of one who has a mind to perceive and a heart to feel whatever is most beautiful and glorious in God's creation, that the power of evil should claim the most just representation of that beauty, that glory, as the instrument of accomplishing its own dark purposes of wretchedness and ruin to man. It is a subject for the deepest regret that this is, and has long been, so far true, as that many readers of pure and elevated moral sentiments, have been accustomed to associate intellectual beauty with moral deformity, so invariably, as to suspect that wherever the former is exhibited, the latter must be a necessary accompaniment. Thus, whenever they are told, on the publication of a new work in some department of fictitious or imaginative literature, that it may be

safely placed in the hands of the young; they insensibly begin to regard that statement as equivalent to one, that the new production has too little life, beauty, richness of thought and imagery, to secure the attention of the young, who have already had a taste of the forbidden fruit, which the tempter urges upon them with disguised and prevailing earnestness. Thus too, many an honest hearted guardian or instructor of youth, feels compelled to warn his charge to shrink from entering what he himself regards as the most brilliant and inviting fields of literature, as they would shrink from the touch of contagion, or from the instigations of the foul fiend.

It is however, as has been already stated, a subject for hope and congratulation, that the exceptions to the general rule of perversity in aim, or inanity in substance, or both, among mere literary writers, are becoming more and more frequent. Occasionally we find one giving to his thoughts a gayer and more diversified coloring than absolute reality would warrant, and yet showing himself to be in earnest in toiling for the improvement and happiness of his fellow men. While the teeming and licentious imagination of French *feuilletonists*, has not ceased to invent "all monstrous and prodigious things" to gratify the diseased appetite of their million readers, there is yet not entirely wanting among all of *these*, the evidence of an honest purpose to expose and break down false theories and old abuses, however little skill they may possess to build up better upon the ruins they make. In Paris itself, the world's emporium of literary, as well as of every other species of trifling, it has been found that mere vivacity of description, and fertility of aimless and useless invention, will no longer ensure an author the sale of a new volume, each returning week. And in England, and in our own country, the demand, even

among readers of magazines and literary weeklies, for something which has strength and reality and a noble aim, is becoming stronger and louder. He who looks for nothing beyond popular success, as a writer for such publications, is taught from many sources, that no small part of the reading world is beginning to turn its patronage in favor of those who speak out, most truthfully and nobly, the genuine emotions of humanity, groaning and sighing for release from the heavy bondage of error, and depravity, and injustice. Thus he is convinced that he, or those soon to come after him, must expect a lot of shame and neglect if, in the face of such a demand for what is earnest, and real, and reformatory, they can exhibit themselves in no higher character than that of inventors and vendors of elegant trifles.

In the department of poetry, (and it is to that principally, that we refer in these observations,) it would be easy to specify instances, both in England and in this country, showing that a single fugitive piece, apparently thrown off by its author in a few happy moments, when nature and humanity, in defiance of art and selfishness, both prompted and guided his effort, has done more to awaken a healthy and strong action in the great heart of the Saxon people, than a lengthened and labored poem, with nothing to commend it, but a soulless and classical beauty, or the revelings of a prodigal imagination, in the misty realm of the ideal. The recent effect of such effusions upon the minds of millions, whose taste for the beautiful and imaginative, had been fed only by affected conceits, or monstrously exaggerated real sentiments, or the reeking garbage of sensualists; has been similar to the impression produced upon the same minds, by the singing of one worthy and justly admired family. People had been accustomed to expect, as a matter of course, at concerts, to hear unintel-

ligible screechings, in what was claimed to be a foreign tongue, though as uttered it was no earthly language, and to see moustached Signore Somebody, and dark-eyed Signorina Somebody-else, go into convulsions, before some thousand spectators, as if about to give up the ghost, in a great agony of tortured and torturing sound. And even they who had any little remains of heart and soul left, beneath the mountain-burden of conventionalism, had been compelled, by fear of losing caste with reputed people of taste, to affect little less extravagant raptures of admiration, that such unearthly, not to say "angelic" or "divine" notes, could be extorted from the human larynx. But when a gracious Providence, as if intent upon presenting anew, some tokens of its first perfect work, to a world that had forsaken their nature, as well as their God, permitted such people to hear *human beings* sing again as of old, "of mercy and of judgment," with notes, words and sentiments, that were all recognized at once to be their own language; that were to them the expression of emotions that they had deemed all unutterable; that "open new fountains in the human heart," as well as stirred the old; while thus wrought upon by the combined power of soul enkindled melody, and soul kindling truth, they felt themselves in too awful and holy a presence, to profane its sanctity by any riotous uproar of their own. They felt that they could call that "divine," with less appearance of blasphemy, since there was so much more in it of man as made in God's image, and not in the mould of fashion, or after the code of fantastic, though tyrant custom. Here was music with no pretensions to "high art." But it needed none; for it was nature, human nature. It was felt to be the outpourings of free, generous human hearts. They needed no newly coined, or foreign termin-

ology, to describe it. Its effect was its only just description.

Precisely the same thing may be said of those soul stirring lyrics, that have occasionally found their way, from some source, into the public prints, within the last few years. It were useless labor to attempt to show them consistent or inconsistent, with rules, derived from any of the ancient or modern masters. Their effect upon intelligent,—nay, upon all minds, proves their inspiration. A single instance will sufficiently explain our meaning. One of these fugitive poems, the production, if we mistake not, of the late Thomas Hood, a few years since, fell under the notice of one, whose great mind also now sees in the vast vision of eternity. He was one of the most keen-sighted of all men, most eloquent, with nothing to adorn or give force to his eloquence, but the crystal clearness of his own thought. With sensibilities that were proof against all causes that were not in reality the most moving, with no taste for poetical composition, as such, he commenced reading the piece, consisting only of a few stanzas. It presented in its own vivid and pregnant manner, thoughts which he recognized at once to be things of his own deep and painful experience, and so overcome was he with his own emotions, that, though he repeatedly attempted, he could not for the time read the few stanzas through. Call the odd rhymes, and the irregular versification of Thomas Hood by what name the critic pleases; his lines or the lines of any other, which will produce such effects, upon such a mind, are poetry. And it is only in giving such vivid and touching expression, to just and true sentiments, that poetry is doing its office, is fulfilling its "mission." And the millions of the poor, the "unfortunate," the down-trodden in Britain, have reason to bless the memory of Thomas Hood, that, notwithstanding all his

apparent trifling with the serious things of life, he did yet, in some instances, with a most awful and imploring earnestness, speak in the ears of the rich and mighty, in their behalf: and they have to thank him, too, for the utterance of what, to their own breaking hearts, has been the great and growing agony of many years. And the future will show, that he and others, animated with still more of the same spirit of deep sympathy with suffering humanity, have not spoken or written in vain. Their "fugitive pieces" will find their way into the gorgeous mansion of the millionaire, the ancestral halls of the peer, and the palace of the sovereign, where the presence of their authors would have been deemed a profanation. And they will enter there, not like the frowning and licentious minstrel of old, to smile, to flatter, and to sing of love; but to cry, like the voice, thought to have been heard by the conscience-smitten Macbeth, to the fair lady, reclining listlessly on the silken divan, and to the proud lord, whose untasked mind is weary with the burden of finding its own diversion; "sleep no more, for the haggard hand of cold and hungering poverty, murders the sleep of groaning millions. The toilers in garrets, in cellars, in mud hovels, fever-smitten and hunger-mad, sleep not. Lean famine, provoked and almost necessitated crime and despairing suicide, sleep not. How canst thou?" Hood's "Song of the Shirt" is still thus speaking, though its author is dead. And it is the appropriate office of poetry, thus to give utterance to the deep woe of the dumb millions, who can only sigh and weep in expression of their misery. It is its office, like the Gospel, to speak for the poor, the heart-broken, the comfortless, and not simply, to pander to the luxuries and vices of those to whom truth is ever a stern and rebuking messenger. If the poet, as is claimed for him, pos-

sess more than woman's tenderness, and childhood's innocence, and a prophet's inspiration, he should exhibit in his verses, a heart throbbing with pity for the pangs of any thing that is high enough in the scale of being to suffer, much more for the highest of God's creatures in this world, man; he should shrink with shuddering horror from the praise of successful crime, and he should speak of truth and righteousness, as one sent from God.

God be thanked, that in this, our "free" America, we have at least one poet, who seems thus to have understood the proper use of the "gift and faculty divine." It would not be strange, however, if many readers among his own countrymen need be told that such a man lives, that his name is JOHN G. WHITTIER. It is very certain that many readers of high-wrought fiction, many weepers over unreal sorrows, many sympathizers with ideal suffering, many haters of imaginary monsters, many fair singers of songs conceived in the prurient brain of the profligate, have never known with what earnest and soul-kindling words, this quiet man of peace has poured out his own deep and deplored commiseration of *their* great sorrow, into whose souls the torturing iron of bondage has been long and pestilently driven. Certain it is that many such readers have never learned to sympathise with this Friend poet, in the lofty and defiant indignation, with which he has hurled his just and fiery rebuke, in the face of the foul spirit of sect, and selfishness, and iron-hearted wrong. And yet, as the world goes, it is no very strange thing that Whittier's Poems, which are but the written emotions of a most generous and lofty soul, should seldom find their way, in embossed covers and embellished leaves, to the parlor table or the drawing room cabinet. For it is for the most part, artificial, affected emotion, that is studied, and practiced, and exhibited

there; not that which comes, bursting like a fire fountain, from a heart thrilling with sympathy for all that is nearest and deepest, and most actual in human woe. Many a gentle mother, who listens with tears to her daughter at her piano, singing the Peri's "Farewell to Araby's daughter," or a legend of some hopeless maiden repining in unrequited love, centuries ago, amid the loathed luxuries of feudal halls, in Andalusia or old Castile, would be ashamed to have that same adored child of hers, learn and sing in the presence of her visitors, "The Farewell of a Virginia slave mother to her daughters, sold into southern bondage." And not because the latter is wanting in poetical sentiment, or in equally touching and beautiful expression. The difference is, that the one is the cold, though glittering frost-work of fiction, while the other is near, present, conscience-smiting truth. Therefore it is, that the one must be received with ecstacies of admiration, while the other must be proscribed and exiled from the realm where custom, and prejudice, and self-styled respectability, hold their tyrant sway. The despairing wail of the slave, mother pierces the heart to the depth where the sense of duty dwells—the ballad reaches no farther than the *nervous*, hysterical region of sentiment. The former rouses emotion, which struggles to vent itself, in noble and benevolent action. The latter excites feeling, only to send it abroad in listless dissipation over far remote time, and distance, and uncertainty; while the starving poor shiver in "untended raggedness" within hearing of that song, and the weary bondman wears his chain in the same land, with his groans unheeded and his wrongs unredressed. And yet the Farewell of the Virginian mother, and many similar productions of the same writer, are not without their power to move, even such hearts as have long been well nigh insensible

to all just and generous feeling. We know nothing of the physical mold of this J. G. Whittier; but if he can *speak* his poems, breathing into the delivery the same living fire which is embodied in them, and if he will do it, even in the strongholds of conventionalism, in the hearing of "brave men and fair women," the former may restrain their indignation at the wrong upon which he pours his scathing reproof, and the latter may forbid their tears to flow for the suffering which he commiserates, if they can.

And here we apply one of the surest tests of the genuineness of all poetical composition. It should be such that it can be *spoken*, and that when well spoken, its successive thoughts, its unfolding meaning, will *tell* upon the mind of the hearer, like each well aimed shot of the canonier, against a wall that has already been shaken, and is falling, stone by stone. Poetry, if it be worthy of the name, loses more than half of its power when deprived of the accompaniment of the voice. The poet even now is under license to speak of himself as a singer, and in the olden time, when his profession and even the present productions in his art received their character, he *did* actually *deliver*, not mumble, and mouth, and barbarize, under the pretence of singing his own verse. And for any one in these days aspiring to the name of poet, to write so obscurely, or with sentiments appealing so little to actual convictions and experience in the human heart, as that his lines cannot be rendered doubly effective by delivery, is for him to show himself unfit for his profession. And to attempt to appreciate the full force of the most true and essential poetry, by only glancing the eye silently over the page whereon it is inscribed, is like attempting to feel the power and beauty of the *Oratorio* of the *Messiah*, or of the *Creation*, by reading its notes silently. He



him. He does not seem to have been possessed by that most common, yet most mistaken notion of poets, that in order to write what shall live after them, they must keep themselves aloof from the interests, the sentiments and the actual, every-day life, of their own time. They think they must vindicate their claim to the name of prophet, or bard, by ever reaching forth, with anxious and empty grasping, for the unseen, the unattained, "the everlasting to be that hath been." And thus when the future becomes the present, and they are numbered with the generations of the past, their works shall still live, and exert a controlling influence over the thoughts, and the more spiritual life, of the generations succeeding. Vain dreamers! Could they even speak of the future with oracular authority; of what worth, would their imperfect and enigmatical responses be, to an age which can look on the reality? And besides, are not the most engrossing subjects of thought and feeling among all men, few in number, and similar in character? And will not the poet best vindicate his title to immortality, by the variety, vigor, or power, of his exhibition of them? It is much the same thing in its most essential particulars, to live this life of ours, in all times. And he who can draw no poetry from human life, much as it can be observed and is experienced wherever men are, such as it must be with all its joys and sorrows and infinite responsibilities, is no poet. If then, any would both acquire fame, and accomplish good to man, by this species of writing, and thus be read and revered in other times, let them imbue their verse with the growing spirit, the toiling, struggling life, of their own age. So have the sons of fame done in all the past. Those that are read, and will be read, by generations to come, are those that spoke most truthfully of their own time. What if they

had thought it unfitting that they should so write as to be read and understood by their cotemporaries, would they be read by us? Is not the present momentarily becoming the past, and as distance throws its enchantment over its wide abyss of forgetfulness and uncertainty, will it not become, in the estimate of ages yet to succeed, far more the region of poetry, the haunt of imagination, the golden realm of ideal beauty, than their own practical, mechanical present? And what names shall then be more surely preserved, from the all engulfing abyss of the past, than those, who have enshrined in their clear and glowing thoughts, the most vivid and truthful representation of that admired and studied period. And above all, if it shall be, as we trust in God and in truth it shall, that at some future time, the yoke of bondage shall be lifted from human limbs and human souls; the narrow and covetous spirit of sect, and creed, and all uncharitableness, shall lose its predominant sway, and whatever is most just, and true, and godlike, in principle and in action, shall be most admired and applauded; whose names will then be gathered out from the dark and selfish past, to be cherished in the most honored remembrance, if not those, who, in the midst of the most hollow pretension, heartlessness and gross iniquity, spoke with the most earnest and thrilling words, in rebuke of wrong, in defense of the helpless, in support of all that is even most true, and real and lasting? And if this shall really be the principle, upon which distant posterity will revere or condemn those who have gone before them, then certainly our author has a fair prospect of receiving much of their honor, and what is more, if it come from the good, much of their gratitude.

These poems deserve commendation also, because they not only sympathize with the age in which

they are written, but also deal with the *realities* of that age. Every period has its imaginary, as well as its actual world; the imaginary of one, differing as much from that of another, as the actual of its own period, differs from that of another, or from the imaginary of either. The present has its own ideal, well peopled with the unsubstantial images, of its own inverted beauty and deformity, happiness and misery. It has its own marital speculations, suddenly accumulated fortunes, impassioned love, deep laid plots of villainy, drawing-room disasters, watering place adventures, ball-room ecstasies. It has its own pretended admiration for the wonders of external nature; its premeditated rhapsodies, over mountain, and lake, and waterfall, storm-cloud, sunset skies, and stormy nights, and all originated within the narrow walls of a starveling author's garret—all, from first to last, having their most substantial existence, in the muslin or paper bound volume, which, not only the boarding-school miss, and the city clerk, but far graver personages, read in the steamboat, the railroad car and the closet, to talk of in the parlor, the social circle, and by the way-side, and to dream of in the dormitory. This is the imaginary world of the present, upon which too many expend whatever they have of thought, feeling, or emotion.

There is also an actual world of the present, which deals in far higher interest, and presents far more subjects for thought and action. It exhibits man as he is, subjected to the demands of the most awful and illimitable responsibilities; a creature capable of soaring forever toward the infinite heights of the divine excellency, or of plunging, with continually accelerated flight, down the dark, unfathomed, infinite abyss of eternal guilt and eternal woe. And this eternal world presents on every hand, instances of this continually increasing excellence in the slow process of attainment by man,

and this continually increasing guilt, and the liabilities to its consequent woe. Within its range the loud curse of the blasphemer, and the importunate prayer of him who would be delivered from continually "besetting sin," are heard together. The agonizing cry of millions in many lands, in bondage to iniquity, to ignorance, to man, goes up to heaven, as a perpetual imprecating sacrifice, to call down vengeance or deliverance. And in this actual world of the present, there are not only wrongs, and woes, and despair; but also love for the outcast, commiseration for the sorrowing, energetic, persevering toil for the good of all, and high hope for the coming of a better day.

It is not strange, that a just appreciation of the real condition of such a world, has led at least one poet, to find in it, subjects fitted to call forth the highest exercise of his powers. No wonder he finds so little occasion to describe imaginary sorrows, while he knows of real, which are so great as to surpass his utmost power of description? How can he waste efforts in endeavoring to make his readers shudder at his pictures of imaginary monsters, when the daily tidings of the times tell him of thousands who foreswear the ties of humanity, and deem God's image in man a thing as base and merchantable as paltry gold? All honor to the poet who dares speak of such things as they are, and who seeks "to build the lofty rhyme" upon the imperishable foundation of truth and righteousness. And thou, great Father, who dost acknowledge, as thy children, the dark browned sons of bondage, not less than their pale brethren of northern climes; give utterance to Voices of **Freedom**, till they shall sound like a trumpet blast throughout all this guilty land, and the foul spirit of oppression shall be scourged, by the fiery bolts of truth, beyond all our borders and out of the world.

## DEWEY'S CONTROVERSIAL WRITINGS.\*

THE greater part of the articles which compose this volume, have been in one form or another, for some time before the public; and have received much of the attention, to which as elegant and impressive discussions, they are certainly entitled. There is great beauty of style—much force, and much felicity, of language about them. They display a rich and vigorous imagination, a fine and cultivated taste, and for the most part an elevated and courteous spirit; to all which we regret that, by the hostile bearing of the work upon our orthodox faith, we are obliged to render but the scanty justice of this paragraph.

We discover also a comprehensive and philosophical turn of thought in many of his discourses; of which that for "Miracles preliminary to the argument for a Revelation," is perhaps the finest specimen. His views too, of inspiration, display the same tendency toward enlarged and general views; though of these we can by no means speak with the same unqualified approbation. This philosophical tendency, however, requires great accuracy of discrimination, and much logical force, to render its results at all valuable. Without these, it is apt to deprive us of facts of the utmost moment, and give us instead of them, only barren and useless generalizations; an objection to which in our view, much of our author's reasoning lies open. The fact however, that Dr. Dewey's work has been so generally known to our readers, and his literary and philosophical merit so generally and highly appreciated, may serve as an apology if we confine

our remarks, to a consideration of it in the aspect to which its controversial character naturally invites us.

The two opening chapters of the volume, one upon "The Unitarian Belief," and the other upon "The nature of Religious Belief," present to us a question of some interest, in which our author stands at issue with Prof. Stuart. In his review of Mrs. Duna's recent work, the last named gentleman has dropped some very significant expressions, with reference to the use of orthodox terms in some portion of the work before us, alledging that in using the words "Atonement, Regeneration, Depravity," &c., to express the religious belief of Unitarians, employing at the same time "an entirely new set of definitions," Dr. D. has been guilty of a "degrading artifice," and one which "merits the scorn of every upright man," &c. These remarks Dr. D. quotes in a note, as "a surprising comment" upon his language and his motives; and replies in a style which, though not undignified, is exceedingly warm. The practice which Prof. S. thus severely repreends, had been so frequent, and is so unjust to what we deem the truth, that though the topic is a most uninviting one, we feel constrained to point out the utter futility of the vindication which Dr. D. has attempted. He argues that he has nowhere professed to use these terms in the orthodox sense, but that "throughout as every reader must see, a discrimination is studiously made between the orthodox and the liberal construction" of them;—that even if used "without any express qualification," "the very position of the writer obviously qualifies them;" and finally that the terms in question are scriptural terms, to which one has as good a

\* Discourses and Reviews, upon questions in Controversial Theology, and Practical Religion. By Orville Dewey, D.D., Pastor of the Church of the Messiah in New York.

right as another. "I had thought speech and Bible speech were common property."

Now as to using this language without any qualification, relying upon his position as a Unitarian to ensure a just interpretation of it, there is one obvious consideration which renders the plea inadmissible in the present instance, however valid it might be in some others. Dr. D. has himself declared that his position itself is "entirely misunderstood";—that there is a strange "misconstruction" of the opinions of himself and his party; so much so that "it seems to be received as if it were a matter of common consent that we do not hold to the doctrines of the Bible and that we scarcely pretend to hold to the Bible itself." All this he asserts on the very first page of his book, and assigns this wide and deep ignorance of his views, as the very reason of his professed endeavor to tell what he understands "the prevailing belief of Unitarians to be." To require a community thus totally misinformed as to "what Unitarianism is," to interpret *any* language by a reference to that system, seems unreasonable enough; but Dr. D. must have strangely forgotten himself to ask that the public would interpret by his general position, the very language in which he professes to define that position. The logic of this paragraph is obviously too loose to require any exposure, or to admit of any defense.

But this is not his main vindication; for that, he relies upon the fact that the language is properly qualified. Has our author then, we are led to ask, so guarded his statements as to forestall the answer of Prof. Stuart? The sufficiency of such disclaimers as he here pleads, must evidently depend very much upon the circumstances of the case. Before his own congregation, who must of course be entirely familiar with his views, the briefest explana-

tion alone would be requisite. Before an assembly of divines the same disclaimer would, for the same reason, be ample. But in a popular discourse this brief and occasional qualification, of language used with the utmost frequency and in connections which carry irresistibly to the public mind, ideas utterly repugnant to those of the speaker, would plainly be very far below what candor and manliness call for. Dr. Dewey's explanations we are constrained to consider precisely of this character; they are far from being so ample as to hold up distinctly and steadily the prominent ideas of his own system.

A writer who aims to disabuse the public mind of a deep seated misapprehension, assumes a peculiar responsibility for his use of language. The surpassing importance too, of the themes on which Dr. Dewey has chosen to write, gives every reader a right to demand the utmost fullness of explanation which can be requisite to a distinct apprehension of his meaning. The total inadequacy of his explanations for this end, becomes apparent the moment we apply to his opponents, our author's vindication of himself. He protests strenuously against the application to his own party, of the somewhat harsh terms in which they are sometimes mentioned. He expresses his astonishment at the bold and confident tone in which it is sometimes said "there is no religion among us";—and declares that no man has a right to charge them with having given up the Bible. The case between them stands thus: 'I believe,' says the one, 'truly and firmly in the atonement, though certainly not in the popular sense of that word.' 'Very good,' says the other, 'I call you an Infidel, though certainly not in the popular sense of that term.' It would certainly require some ingenuity to show that Dr. D.'s vindication of himself is not equally good for his opponent. If his simple and occasional disclaimer

of the popular meaning, is a sufficient justification of his usage, it justifies also all that he so earnestly protests against, in the usage of others.

If our author were to be assailed as "an ungodly man, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ," very slender justification would he deem it, to be told that all this was studiously declared to be not in the popular but the scriptural import of the language. And if such a vindication would be felt and declared to be a mere cover for theological rancor, in any opponent who should solemnly declare that in that sense he most fully believed it, how can it furnish any justification for Dr. Dewey's usage? Let any man describe the Unitarian as a man 'full of all subtlety, and mischief, unceasingly perverting the right ways of the Lord,' and he would find that no cautious statement that he used the terms not in the popular sense but in what he really deemed a more scriptural and just one, would exempt him from the charge of calumny. He would be told that whoever uses such terms not in their popular meaning, has no right to use them in a popular discourse; and that none but a covert and unworthy design could lead him to persist in it.

As for the "right" of using "common property" in this manner, Dr. Dewey's concessions effectually negative that. It needs no argument to prove that no one has a right to use any language which perpetually and necessarily misleads men; and that this use of scriptural language does so mislead, is beyond a question. Our author himself tells us that at first, Unitarians hesitated about the use of these terms, because they "stood in the prevailing usage for orthodox doctrines." When to this admission, we add the repeated and most earnest assertions of all orthodox readers, that they themselves

are constantly confounded by this language, it can not be doubted that it is felt to be on the part of all who employ it, a source of incessant misapprehension. Since then the language by their own admission conveys to the popular ear only the idea of the orthodox doctrine, why persist in the use of it? Dr. D. has exposed the reason with a simplicity which provokes some wonder. "The body of the people," he says, page 5, "not often hearing from our pulpits the contested words and phrases, \* \* \* hold themselves doubly warranted in charging us with a defection from the faith of Scripture." His use of scriptural language then, is not because it really conveys to those who hear it scriptural ideas; it is a mere theological artifice, employed for a sectarian purpose.

The question narrows itself at once then to this: Has any one the right to create constant misapprehension, for the sake of avoiding unjust aspersions upon his character and his faith? Has any one the right to create erroneous impressions of his system, for the sake of giving that system greater currency? To these questions an honorable mind can render but one answer. We say therefore, that Dr. D. has failed to make out any justification of his usage.

Still it will no doubt be termed a hardship that the Unitarian should be shut out from the common heritage of Christendom, and forbidden to give utterance to his religious convictions, in the consecrated words of inspiration. One additional consideration will serve to show how unfounded even this impression is. If it is really a hardship to be compelled to abandon the scriptural mode of expression, how does it happen that on certain subjects the Unitarian so readily and cheerfully does abandon it. On the topic of eternal retribution, no Unitarian ever adopts the phraseology of the Bible. Dr. D. himself takes occasion

more than once, to explain and vindicate at large his views of this topic; and we have carefully examined his language. He does indeed say that "all the language of Scripture on this solemn subject we have no hesitation about using;" but he nowhere ventures to use in the expression of his faith, any one of its decisive declarations. Nay, he evidently feels not the least disposition to employ a certain style of Scripture language in defining his views upon it. This departure from biblical usage he vindicates most satisfactorily, indeed, on the ground that "popular ignorance" has so fixed the meaning of this phraseology, that "it is difficult to use it without constant explanation." Very true; but then why employ this kind of language on other subjects, in respect to which "popular ignorance" is equally profound? Why, when popular ignorance perpetually misunderstands this language, insist upon a right of perpetuating the confusion? Is the consideration that Unitarianism might suffer somewhat in popular estimation, a ground on which a generous mind can feel content to abate a jot or tittle of its endeavor to convey the most accurate conceptions of its faith? That it would suffer seriously from such an endeavor, we most certainly believe; but this conviction in the mind of one who receives that system as the sum of Christian truth, would betray a pitiable want of confidence in truth itself. We might pursue this subject farther, but it is by no means an agreeable one, and we gladly leave it. We have said enough to sustain the remark with which we conclude our discussion of it; that in pursuing a course which to say the least of it, is so questionable, Dr. D. must be indebted altogether more to the courtesy of his opponents, than to any well founded claims of his own, for his exemption from the unpleasant terms in which Prof. S. has characterized it.

There is perhaps no one of the subjects mentioned in this volume which Dr. Dewey discusses with deeper interest than that of the Trinity. In a discourse now first presented to the public, on the theme "that errors in theology have sprung from false principles of reasoning," his most important application of the principle is to this doctrine, and his remarks upon it disclose a sense of its importance, with which we most heartily sympathize.

After a very earnest presentation of his objections to the orthodox view of it, he speaks thus:—"So powerful, so overwhelming, has appeared to me the argument against the Trinity, that for years I confess I have been looking for its effect upon the churches of England and America. I have sometimes involuntarily said—Is it possible that what appears so clear to me, so unanswerable, can go for nothing with the minds of others? What are the men of England and America thinking?" &c. We will not withhold the expression of our respect for the earnest spirit in which these remarks are conceived; nor can we help regarding the frankness with which they are uttered, as highly honorable to their author; especially when contrasted with the resolute and uncandid disposition which we have found in some other quarters, to consider this a settled question.

Probably every intelligent observer of the progress of opinion has cherished similar anxieties; has waited, and watched, and longed, to see some token of the things which he felt assured "must shortly come to pass." The advocate of free communion has looked with interest for the effect of the calm and resistless logic of Robert Hall; and he finds at length the whole Baptist community in England, pervaded with his sentiments to an extent he had scarcely hoped for. The Protestant has waited and prayed for the reaction which he knows must be at

band, against the forms and superstitions with which Rome has supplanted the Gospel ; and he beholds all over the blood-sprinkled soil of France—in the realms of monarchs who gloried in the title of “ most Catholic”—wherever, in short, the hand of power leaves any access to the millions it has so long and so jealously guarded against our approach, almost in the Vatican itself, the unquestionable tokens of what he has so longed to see. The lover of religious freedom has anxiously listened for the response which all christendom is yet to make to the announcement of our separation of church and state ; and he hears swelling from the glens of Scotland and the vales of Switzerland, the sound which confirms his faith in freedom. And amid all this universal progress of truth, the Unitarian too listens for the tokens which are to convey to him the grateful intelligence that he is no longer to be cut off from the sympathies of the universal church ; but alas ! no cheering voice brings him that consolation—over the broad earth he finds no sign that he is not as isolated, and his views as widely rejected as they have ever been. What a melancholy position ! Why will he not, we are tempted to ask, let it awaken for once, that wholesome distrust of his system, which alone can ever bring him into sympathy with the mass of Christian minds.

The tone in which our author urges his views, is one which, while it is designed to be expressive of the strongest confidence, is by no means arrogant or offensive. Again and again he earnestly objects that our doctrine involves a palpable contradiction ; and argues that it is impossible for any one, steadily and consistently, to maintain his faith in it. “ So distinct,” says he, p. 343, “ are these persons of the Trinity in your idea of them, that no power of human reason or imagination can make them one being.” He main-

tains repeatedly that even when worshiping Jesus, the Trinitarian does for the time drop all thought of any other being, and simply investing him with divine attributes, “ is, and his mind compels him to be, virtually a Unitarian.

The charge of inconsistency at this point, comes, in the present state of the Unitarian body, with a very ill grace from them ; and if we might for once assume to advise, we would counsel Dr. D. to abandon it. When we see their religious edifices designated by no significant names save those of the person and works of Christ—dedicated with all the solemnity their system of faith can supply, to Him as their “ Teacher, Redeemer, and Lord”—when we hear them venturing to offer no petition to the paternal goodness which Christ has revealed, but it must be slavishly offered in His name—seeking no blessing of the Merciful Father, but it must be entreated for His sake—when we see them thus standing before Christ with all that other men call religious homage, we smile at these charges of inconsistency between our faith and our worship. We bid the opponents who can attain to no higher views of Christ than these poor assaults upon the system which exalts him, take one lesson from the deep convictions to which they are evermore unconsciously giving utterance. We bid them listen to the sensibilities and affections which, in all that portion of the body that seems to us to have most of the spirit of piety, seem yet loyal to the truth as it is in Jesus ; and which proclaim amid all the negations of their theory, the indissoluble connection between the piety which these men cherish, and the doctrines they deplore.

And here we doubt not is the secret, in part at least, of the phraseology which to the no small scandal of their system, Unitarian writers find themselves impelled to use, and yet unable to justify. They are not

exempt from the power of the ancient faith. They were taught to bow the knee and lisp the prayer of infancy, to a Savior who died for them ;—they have been surrounded ever since with the symbols of a faith which “ knows nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified ;”—a history illustrious with examples of evangelical piety—a literature rich with imperishable works of evangelical devotion, have environed and moulded them since they had a being : till now as often as they bend in prayer or send up their song of praise—as often as they preach or hear the Gospel of the Redeemer, the name of Christ mingles itself with each solemn act, and as we behold their devotions we seem to hear the very voice of nature within them doing reverent homage to the grand object of Christian worship.

In respect to the Trinity, Dr. Dewey makes his first issue upon a principle of interpretation. This he affirms to be of such vital moment that “ it settles the whole question.” He magnifies so highly the importance of this principle, that one is a little amused when he comes to state it, to find it dwindling into the very familiar and harmless one, that the Bible is to be interpreted like other books. “ It is the principle that words are not to be taken by themselves in the Bible ;—that limitations and qualifications in their meaning must be admitted ;—that the Scriptures are in this respect to be interpreted like other books,” &c., (page 62,) as though orthodoxy made war upon that !

But let us test Dr. Dewey’s adherence to this principle, and try the strength of his cause upon his chosen ground. The infidel objects to the Unitarian believer in inspiration, that the Bible is utterly repugnant to the goodness of God, in teaching the “ everlasting punishment” of the wicked. How does he repel the charge ? Why, he maintains that the word everlasting is capable of a

different meaning. Very true, says the former, but what is there to show that it is *entitled* in this place to the construction you propose ? Why is it not to be allowed its full import ? especially as in a connection immediately adjacent, and precisely similar, it denotes by general consent the absolutely endless blessedness of the just ? To this question Dr. D. may be challenged to frame any reply, which does not assume the inspiration of the sacred volume, and make it the ground of a claim that the Scripture is not to be so interpreted as to conflict with the divine character. Again ; suppose it maintained that Christ as a mere cunning impostor claimed a divine and pre-existent nature ; and his own words, “ the glory which I had with thee before the world was,” alledged in support of the charge. Now nothing is more common than similar attempts to awaken superstitious reverence. If such an expression were found to have been used by any other professed prophet, it would beyond all question receive precisely this interpretation. How then does the Unitarian escape this conclusion in the present instance ? He assumes that the inspiration of the Scriptures furnishes ground for an interpretation of them different from that of other and similar records. In the argument with those who admit inspiration, he finds no difficulty. He says evermore, ‘ Such a construction is inadmissible because it is absurd ;’ but of this inspiration, his own scheme, we most seriously believe, can furnish no proof whatever. His vaunted principle sweeps away the very ground beneath his feet.

When we find the Apostle prefacing his affecting biography of the Master who loved him, with the mysterious announcement that the Logos existed in the beginning with God, and was God—attributing in language most deliberate and peculiar, each mighty work of creation to his

power—and then proceeding, in terms which defy all other application, to identify this divine agent with the Savior whose glory they had themselves beheld, we interpret all this as the designed announcement of a truth most sublime. We do this, not because the Bible is to be interpreted differently from other books, but because if we found such an account in the Vedas, or the sacred books of any people, we should feel constrained by every law of language to do the same there. And so would Dr. Dewey: so does he interpret each similar account in the religious literature of every nation under heaven. There, he pronounces it all the mere superstition of a barbarous age; but it never occurs to him, or to any one, to deny that it was originally designed and received as a statement of literal truth. Let our readers judge then whether it is on his part or on ours, that the Bible is interpreted with all the limitations which the common judgment of mankind imposes, on the early records of the religious history of our race.

The confidence with which Dr. Dewey asserts the impossibility of conceiving of the persons of the Trinity as any other than three beings, apart from the question of its truth, is far from being justified by the amount of argument he has adduced in support of it. When he so earnestly asserts that "the dogma of the Trinity destroys every kind of unity which can be conceived of in an intelligent being," (page 344,) we naturally look for some analysis of the nature of being—some argument to show in what its unity consists. But beyond the mere assertion, that "when we speak of unity in a being we mean that he is self-conscious," there is not the least attempt at such analysis. He nowhere aims to show what the elements of our idea of being are.

Now it is precisely upon such an analysis that the common orthodox

VOL. VI.

10

theory of the doctrine is founded. Trinitarians generally consider the idea of a being to include two great elements—the *substance* and its *properties*. These elements belong necessarily to our idea of each existing thing; it is a substance possessing certain properties. In the instance of a material substance, these are the properties of solidity, extension, form, color, &c.; in the case of a spiritual being, they are the various faculties of thought, emotion, will, &c. The common theory of the Trinity is, that in the Divine Being there is a multiplication of these attributes;—there are three several faculties of action and of consciousness, which all inhere similarly in the same common substance. To each of these classes of attributes, the name *person* is given. It will be at once perceived, that if this idea of the nature of being is correct, it affords a ready reply to all the oft repeated assertions, that we can not conceive of distinct persons without subverting the Divine Unity. We point at once to the grand element of all being, lying simple and undivided, at the basis of our conception, and say that while there is no distinction *there*, there is no force in this charge. The word *being* denotes a complex idea, and until there is a triplication of each of the elements which compose it, there is no triplication of the idea itself. Such a triplication every Trinitarian disclaims; and while it is disclaimed, we must consider the charge that tritheism is essentially involved in their doctrine, one which a careful analysis not only refuses to support, but distinctly contradicts.

Dr. D. seems to imply (for as we have said he attempts no formal analysis) that consciousness and certain other faculties constitute our whole idea of a being. On this assumption, he argues that the duplication of these faculties amounts to a duplication of the being. But if the idea of being includes another es-

essential element, then evidently no mere multiplication of consciousness, will, &c. involves the multiplication of that idea. Our author implies that consciousness and moral faculties are the sole elements of our conception of a being; a position to which we at once take the exception, that it assumes all that is decisive in the argument. Orthodoxy holds that there is *another* element, fundamental to that conception, on the strict unity of which, its assertion of the unity of a Tri-personal God is founded. Dr. Dewey can not but perceive, as we thus state the question between him and the orthodox, how entirely his discussions fall short of reaching the grounds on which they rest; and how necessarily, in consequence, his conclusions must fail to command their acquiescence.

Dr. Dewey's argument proceeds on the supposition, conceded by some Trinitarians, that the unity of the Godhead necessarily implies an absolute identity of attributes in the persons of the Trinity; and all the strength of his argument depends on this hypothesis and concession. But the common theory contained in these memorable words of the old Confessions—"the same in substance—equal in power and glory"—is certainly entitled, if not refuted, to be considered a triumphant defense of the doctrine of the Trinity against the charge of inconsistency.

The objection is, that distinct wills, consciousnesses, &c., in the persons of the Trinity, would render the doctrine inconsistent with the unity of God. What then, we ask, is the unity of which the orthodox view admits. We say nothing of unity of design, though it must be evident that the harmony of counsel and purpose between persons so intimately related must far surpass any which can be deemed to characterize the counsels of beings substantially distinct; the scheme implies an *absolute philosophical unity*. The persons are really one being,

by virtue of the unity of their substance. The conception of substance is one of the most important of all our necessary ideas: the charge of "theoretical" tritheism against a scheme which lays so broad and palpable a ground for absolute unity of nature, we can only say, surprises us.

But a candid estimate of our theory must concede to it a higher unity than this. Conscious unity is (besides the substantial unity of which we have just spoken) the only other unity of which we can conceive. Now to this it is essential that the mind should know itself as distinct from every other; should feel that in the conscious experience of another, it has no participation. It is on this ground that our conception of our own individuality is so vivid. We have no participation of the experience of others, and we know that their experience stands in no connection with ourselves. Now supposing such a personal distinction as we advocate, to exist in the divine mind, it is obvious that there could not coexist with it, any such consciousness of individuality as would convey the idea of three separate beings. Each must be aware of the thoughts and acts of the others as sustaining a close relation to himself. Each must conceive of the faculties of another as sustaining to the common substance, the same intimate relation as his own. There may be therefore a conscious unity of a very high kind, based upon consciousness of identity in the substance of their being, and conscious participation of each other's experience. The capacity of separate action is the only element, in which such persons would not absolutely blend into identity.

Now certainly, it is not to be claimed that the idea of unity which consciousness gives us, is the only possible one. There may be a *real* unity which yet, does not imply precisely the same elements as ours.

The grounds of moral agency, and of personal identity, may vary somewhat in beings of different natures; reason may be in other orders of beings, as certainly as it is in God, materially different from what it is in man. Why then may not the unity of the divine nature vary within certain moderate limits, just as the intelligence of that nature does, from ours? Evidently persons who are thus "the same in substance," conscious of that identity and on the ground of it conscious to an extent which may be very great, of the experience of each other, are not simple and separate beings; are one in their inward nature—one in their outward development, and possibly one in their conscious knowledge. Such a unity falls but little short of the highest conceivable.

The possibility of this theory, no Unitarian has made any strenuous effort to disprove. We find no careful discussion of it by any one of them. Channing, Ware, Sparks, Dr. Dewey himself, which of them devotes a solitary page to the examination of it? Prof. Norton, whose work is generally deemed a comprehensive and complete summary (and certainly it professes to be so) of "the different forms which the modern doctrine has been made to assume," does not even mention that it is held by any class of his opponents. If we are wrong in these remarks, we shall cheerfully submit to correction. If there is any Unitarian discussion of this theory, we beg to have it pointed out. We would not affirm that there is no allusion in the writings of the men we have mentioned, to the distinction of substance and attribute as connected with this doctrine; but that they have made no extended and explicit attempt to overthrow the theory, is evident from their own language on the subject. Dr. Ware, in his most recent work, says that "none have pretended to explain or to understand what is meant by a person as

distinguished from a being, or wherein any number of separate persons differ from the same number of separate beings."\* No one who compares this statement with the very palpable distinction we have made between the terms mentioned, can fail to see that it must have been made in absolute oversight of our theory.

The call for a *Unitarian* analysis of this subject has been long and earnestly made. It is in itself, too, a most reasonable demand, that writers who are perpetually asserting that the statements of others are inconsistent with the unity of God, should tell us in the way of extended argument in what the unity of being consists. To an argument upon that subject, Unitarianism has never committed itself; perhaps we may provoke them to that good work, if we add that we have little expectation that it will; though till it does, Dr. D. has small reason to wonder at the perversity with which "the men of England and America" turn a deaf ear to the "charms" of its advocates.

We have dwelt so long upon these topics that we are constrained to pass over entirely some which we should be glad to notice in more favorable terms; Dr. Dewey's exhibition of the doctrines of depravity, and of conversion, require particular notice.

His account of the first of these subjects is prejudiced throughout by a serious error. He maintains that our view of it includes the dogma that there is no natural freedom in the human mind to do good: that Calvinists believe that "men have lost the power of recovery, all voluntary moral power to be good and pure." He represents the evangelical theology as teaching, and stands aghast at the "astounding paralyzing contradiction; that we are commanded, on pain of God's eternal dis-

\* Ware's Inquiry concerning Religion, vol. ii, p. 146.

pleasure, to do that which we have no power to do,"—&c. &c., p. 361. Now Dr. D. ought certainly to know that among those who uphold the doctrine of the entire depravity of man, are some, not to say many, who regard with the deepest disapprobation the dogma he thus indiscriminatingly imputes; men who have grown gray in protesting with all the emphasis of language, against confounding *this* with the evangelical system; men who have pursued the error which he here seems to charge upon them, through every possible evasion; and who have received for their earnest toil an abundant and thankless requital. Nay, the honor of *that* improvement in the popular theology has been already won.

Aiming to identify this repulsive tenet with the doctrine of depravity, he argues that the two are most intimately connected—that "if a man is totally depraved he can have no freedom to be good—if he has no freedom to be good he is indeed totally depraved."—p. 359. We crave the indulgence of our orthodox readers for detaining *them* with even the briefest reply to this charge. What possible depravity can exist in a mind which has really "*no freedom to be good?*" Such a man is no more depraved than the animal creation—has no more obligation or responsibility than a maniac. What sin can be justly charged with, who can do no better than he does?

On the other hand, nothing would be easier, were we in the humor for such trifling, than to show that Dr. Dewey has himself taught a philosophy utterly at variance with moral freedom. Virtue is in his system as truly *necessary* as sin can be in any other. For the mind, on his view of it, necessarily forms "the idea of moral rectitude," and the idea he tells us implies the previous existence of "the *feeling* of rectitude"—and this feeling of rectitude he esteems virtuous, he says it is "*right.*"

Every man therefore is by the most stringent necessity virtuous in some degree; though what species of rectitude that is, which exists in the mind antecedently to the very "idea" of rectitude, Dr. D. is perhaps safe in not attempting to specify.

In quite a kindred strain he proceeds in his review of Wardlaw, (an author whose teachings some Calvinistic writers have earnestly repudiated, but whom, nevertheless, Dr. D. chooses to consider the exponent of Calvinistic opinions,) to deny to Calvinism any genial or kindly tendencies. "What sort of practical ethics," he asks, "would follow from this system?" Then picturing our world as a depraved and doomed one, he inquires, (p. 387,) "Under the dread shadow of this system, what can remain to its consistent votary? What can be his ties to society at large? can he have friendship? can he wish for intercourse with unregenerate men, bad men, utterly bad men? Why should he? What is there in them to love? If he must be connected with them by business or kindred, yet what are these *circumstances* compared with the great ties of moral relationship? And the moral relationship on the part of the regenerate can be nothing but that of superiority, and pity, and prayer; not of friendship." We pause in a wonder that deepens into amazement at the hardihood of this most grievous charge. Firmly believing all that is here charged as so odious and repulsive in the orthodox faith, we have had occasion to utter many a mournful assertion of human sinfulness, but such a statement as this, never. Many a denial have we felt constrained to frame of the natural *holiness* of the human heart; but the natural sympathies and affections which bind man to man, we never had the heart to deny to any thing that breathes. Often have we felt constrained to question the reality

of much that passes for religion among the class whom Dr. Dewey represents; but that they were, or must be, insensible to each warm and genial impulse—that in proportion as they drink in the spirit of their faith they must become dead to each lovely sentiment that adorns human nature, recreant to each obligation that binds to love, to confidence, to gratitude, among men;—lost to all that is honorable and generous beyond their own narrow pale;—absolutely incapable of all affection and even of all “friendship”—the most cold hearted believer in our dark and cheerless creed never stigmatized his kind with an accusation like this! And why has Dr. Dewey put it forth? Has inspiration taught him to paint this repulsive picture of all who cordially imbue their minds with the great truth he thus scoffs at? He will not pretend it. Is he constrained by that conviction of its absolute necessity to human salvation, which alone calls forth the believer's melancholy and reluctant statements? No; there is no such necessity upon him. Is it in the heat of debate that he has given utterance to these cutting and bitter words? No; it is from the calm solitude of his study, and with the nicest touches of his art upon them, that he sends them forth, upon a cool calculation of the advantage they may bring to the interests of the party for which he pleads.

And what has Calvinism done that it should be deemed the fit object of these reproaches? Let the inquiry be understood, for it is not the Calvinism of election and the saints' perseverance that he here attacks, but that which maintains the entire depravity of mankind and the endless retrIBUTions of eternity; what we say has this system done, that of all the superstitions which have disgraced humanity, this should be singled out for the very palm of infamy? One would think that its his-

tory must be “written in bile and blood”—that it is some malignant system, breathing pestilence whithersoever it comes—one before which all the elements of human happiness wither and die—one whose adherents have testified no kind attachments, manifested no glowing zeal for the good of their race, and borne no share in the sufferings and achievements to which liberty and civilization and religion have been indebted. Dr. D. himself asks the question, “What has Calvinism done? Into what literature has it ever breathed its spirit? What poem has it ever written, but Pollock's Course of Time? What philosophy but Dr. Wardlaw's? Into what reveries of genius but those of Bunyan has it ever breathed its soul?”

We will tell Dr. Dewey. What literature? The noblest religious literature which the earth contains—works of devotion, more than we can name, which shall be cherished while the earth stands. What poetry? The whole religious poetry of the language bears the impress, and far the larger part of it the names of the men who receive this detested scheme. What philosophy? All Christian philosophy in the language which is worthy the name—works of philosophical theology which from Calvin's days to those of Dwight and Chalmers, have taken rank at the head of the philosophical thinking of Christendom—works which with all their imperfections will hold that rank, till others from the same source shall surpass them.

But such as these are not its highest exploits. It is to moral achievements that it owes its chief renown. It has inspired a heroic endurance which challenges everlasting remembrance. Heaven seems to have found no sterner, truer band, to whom to entrust the post of danger and of glory. Laud and Graham of Claverhouse, Mary and the Ninth

Charles and Alva, whose are the sufferings and the heroism which these names recall? This western shore, for religious freedom and religious power, the glory of all lands, to whose indomitable love of freedom and of truth does it owe the glorious career it is but beginning to run? To whose faith did approving heaven vouchsafe that sublimest conception of their age, here through all toil to hew out of the wilderness the future home of civilization, hither through all peril, to bear the seeds of liberty and piety for all the generations?

And in our own day, whose charity that "never faileth," is bearing abroad the everlasting Gospel? Whose love is it that has consented to share each privation, each hardship, each peril under which nature can subsist? Whose noble contempt of danger has braved and tamed the cannibal ferocity of savage tribes, confronted the capricious tyranny of Indian despots, and penetrated through sands and snows, where the foot of civilized man had never trod, in the heavenly purpose "to seek and to save that which was lost?" What system is that which leaning on the very arm of the Almighty, has made its way into every haunt of heathenism, and reared, all unconscious of the glory which was gathering over it, in all lands which encompass the earth, monuments of its attachment to the human soul, to the truth, to the kingdom of God? Let it not be said that these men whose deeds have shed a new luster upon the Gospel itself, are not the "consistent votaries" of Calvinism. Naught else under heaven than these views of the utter depravity and hopelessness of mankind, ever nerved the fortitude of manly piety and the tenderness of woman's love, for this work of love.

We might retort this inquiry. We might ask what are the deeds of Unitarian benevolence, that it should feel entitled to take us thus to task;

but we forbear. Trophies like these need no contrast to heighten them, and we spare Dr. Dewey the humiliation of a reply to any inquiry for the achievements of Unitarian heroism and devotion. These are the works—and human history records none nobler—into which our system has "breathed its spirit;" we bid Dr. D. look at them, as the wide world is learning to do, and blush to remember, what we feel with pride we can afford to forget, that he has suffered himself invidiously to ask what Calvinism has done in the earth, and what are the ties which bind the Calvinist to his race?

With our author's views of depravity, his idea of conversion maintains a melancholy consistency. He not only doubts the reality, but he denies the possibility, of any sudden change in the essentials of character. He admits indeed that "religion has a beginning," and that there are great "epochs" of improvement which mark its progress; but the possibility of any thing like a sudden and radical change of character, such as the current theology insists upon, he utterly denies. "No change of the inward mind and character can be sudden. The very laws of the mind forbid it." Let us test this alledged impossibility.

A company of profane and intemperate men, hardened by years of dissipation against all healthful influence from without, are led by some unusual course of their own thoughts, to forswear for all coming life the base appetite which has enslaved them; and go from their accustomed haunt of vice, never again to gratify by one moment's indulgence, what has hitherto been the ruling passion of life. The spendthrift whose debaucheries have at length exhausted his estate, sits in unwonted thoughtfulness for hours, and rises from his meditations, strong in purposes which control and supplant each previous impulse of his being. On the very lowest account

of facts like these, we must see in them, an absolute and sudden victory over some of the strongest impulses which form the character ; and even supposing them to be but changes from the control of one sin or passion to that of another, yet if impulses erroneous and false, can so subdue and change the habits and passions of all previous life, what may not be hoped for from truth and wisdom, in the bands of omnipotence and love ? Why then is it to be deemed a thing impossible, that grace from on high should suddenly work even a radical and entire change of character ?

But the rashness of this assertion rises even to recklessness, when we compare it with the unquestionable facts of the Gospel history. What was Paul's conversion but a most sudden change of the "inward mind and character ?" Or will it be maintained that the Apostle was "inwardly" the same persecuting bigot after that event that he was before ? And who needs to be reminded that Christianity has achieved similar triumphs in every year of its existence since ? Who that has read the narrative of a conversion like that of Col. Gardiner, or the early history of Methodism, or the religious history of our own country, needs any argument for the possibility of radical and sudden changes of character ? Erroneous however as the position is that we are controverting, one truth it may well be supposed to convey to us. Dr. D. could never have maintained the impossibility of such results, had he ever witnessed them. Had he ever known in his familiar ministrations, the sensual and profligate mind suddenly arrested, subdued, purified by the doctrine which it was his work to unfold—had he seen the vain and thoughtless spirit, suddenly awed into a seriousness deep and permanent—had he ever beheld a man who delighted in expressing his profane contempt for every ordinance of piety, in ensnaring youth and se-

ducing innocence, changed at once into a soul breathing only penitence and self-abasement, no sophistry could have blinded his mind to these signal attestations of the power of his faith. Let him not then be surprised if the evangelical body should find in an argument like this, confirmation of all its previous convictions of the inefficiency and worthlessness of his system ; and should on the strength of these concessions, pronounce it utterly alien from that gospel, which every age has proved to be "the power of God unto salvation."

The religion which this work enforces, and the skepticism which it repels, would amply repay examination. They indicate, the one in theory, and the other in practice, defects of the most serious nature. All religious philosophy which is not absolutely perfect, has its opposite tendencies, its points of repulsion as well as of attraction, and stands in relation to unbelief as well as to faith. The type therefore of unbelief against which any religious system contends, is often highly significant of the true character of that system. Thus the superstitions of the papal church are by almost all Protestant writers alledged to tend powerfully toward infidelity, and even atheism ; and Unitarians have not been slow to adduce similar results from the errors of the orthodox faith. But the skepticism against which Dr. Dewey contends, is little else than the most cheerless and wretched negation even of immortality itself. Yet of this abandoned scheme he says, with a tenderness which contrasts strangely and significantly with his bitter reprobation of Calvinism, "I do not wish to speak harshly." On the edge of this dismal abyss he assumes his position, and courteously contends with this grim skeleton of unbelief, that God and immortality are realities ; or at least if some doubts do necessarily mingle with our faith in them, doubting is ever a salutary process,

and meanwhile it is far more reasonable to believe than to deny.

But defective as are his views of religious philosophy, his exhibition of practical religion seems yet more so. He seems resolved on cutting off the soul from all those truths which yield it most effective influence,—from all those modes of action which afford it the most profitable culture. Religion is in his view of it, wholly subjective; it has no great and sublime relations to any out of the mind itself. Personal elevation and dignity of no inferior kind indeed, still, merely personal, is all that he enforces with any earnestness. Do not be a bigot, or a hypocrite; do not dwell in sottishness or vice; remember your immortal nature and do for heaven's sake be something generous—this seems the whole burden of his exhortation. Without doubting the truth or the importance of this scheme of instruction, we must yet question whether all that human nature calls for, and all that the word of God supplies, will come within the compass of *this*. It is destitute of all the elements which are most powerful to move our moral nature. We can not barter for this the system which presents as the grand objects of religious thought, the attributes, the character, the government of God. We can not barter for this, the boundless love and tenderness of our divine Redeemer, and the reclaiming and renewing grace of the Holy One—love and grace which are able to subdue more of human sinfulness than Dr. D. is able to believe in.

Still less can we accept the teaching which declares, that "brotherly love and hope and faith derive from the circumstances of the early age, a prominence and peculiarity which ought since to have passed away;" which instead of enforcing with all emphasis the earnest study of the heavenly word, tells us that this "formal and forced perusal of obscure chapters with a sort of demure

reverence tends to throw dullness and doubt and obscurity over all our conceptions of religion;" which discourages all personal religious effort as calculated only to "distress and terrify" men, and as "planting in the mind the seeds of superstition which a whole life often is not sufficient to eradicate;" and which quotes only to stigmatize as "odious and offensive freedoms of speech," the simple and modest expressions in which affection terms the Savior "dear" and Christ "precious."

We offer no comment in terms of pious horror upon these pregnant and promising statements; we utter no "sepulchral tones of awe and lamentation." They might check Dr. Dewey in the wholesome work to which he has put his hand; and we would have him by all means carry it on. Let him show how many Christian affections he can repudiate—upon how much of Christian effort he can cast reproach—upon how much of the language and the sentiment of the Bible he can pour contempt. It will be a salutary disclosure. When the popular mind shall come to understand, that Unitarianism esteems "brotherly love and hope and faith" as obsolete, that system will be itself far on the way to the oblivion to which it is destined. Let it proclaim the idea that while "the most abandoned of men *only* (!) make vice odious," parental faithfulness "makes virtue so;" and it will instantly be spurned as an outrage upon all that binds the parent to his offspring. Let it pronounce all ardent personal attachment to Christ, fanciful and visionary, and the humble and scriptural expression of it, "odious and offensive," and we can not for one moment doubt, that when all this is fully understood, whatever piety may exist among men, will pronounce its philosophy a melancholy delusion, and its Christianity a melancholy abandonment of all that is peculiar and all that is precious in the Gospel of our salvation.

## CHRISTIAN COMPREHENSIVENESS.

We are not among those who regard the Christian sects as equivalent to so many schisms. Neither is it necessary, in our view, to the unity of the church, that it should be politically one; indeed the polity of the Anglican establishment and that of the American Episcopal church are as truly separate, one from the other, as the latter from the Congregational polity. As little is it necessary to the unity of Christ's body, that the several polities should be similar to each other; for here again it can be shown, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the polity of the Anglican establishment is less resembled, as regards all practical purposes, to that of the American Episcopal church, than the latter to the Congregational. So if we speak of brotherly love or the unity of the Spirit, it is clear that distinct and dissimilar forms of polity work no necessary detriment. How often indeed is it proved that proximity exasperates disagreements, and that men will only hate each other the more cordially, the closer the bond which unites them. Doubtless there is such a thing as schism, divisions that are wrought by evil passions, therefore dishonorable, hurtful and criminal; and such is the weakness of our nature that there are doubtless vestiges of schism, in all Christian bodies. Still it is our privilege, on the whole, and being our privilege, our duty, to regard the Christian sects, not as divisions, but as distributions rather; for it is one of the highest problems of divine government in the church, as in all other forms of society, how to effect the most complete and happy distribution—such a distribution as will meet all wants and conditions, content the longings, pacify the diversities and edify the common growth of all. Thus it may be said that

the present distribution of the church, abating what is due to causes that are criminal, makes it more completely one; just as an army, set off into companies and battalions, some trained to serve as infantry and some as horse, some with artillery and some with the rifle, undergoing each a form of exercise and discipline peculiar to itself, becomes thereby not several and distinct armies, but because of the orderly distribution made, a more complete and perfect whole—in the field, an engine of greater power, because it unites so many forms of action and bears so many sorts of armor.

At the same time, it is not to be denied that this manifold distribution of the church has its propriety, in causes and events that imply a crude state, or a state of only partial development. Therefore, while we do not regret the distribution, or proclaim it as the public shame of religion, we may well desire a riper state, in which the Christian body shall coalesce more perfectly and draw itself towards a more comprehensive and catholic polity. The work of distribution and redistribution has already gone far enough, as most Christians appear to suppose. We see, indeed, that unity is rising, now, as a new ideal upon the Christian world. They pray for a closer fellowship; they flock together from the ends of the world to consult for unity. A proper and true catholic church is before the mind, as an object of longing and secret hope as never before—it is named in distant places, and by men who have had no concert, save through the Spirit of God and the spirit of the age. And if these are signs of capacity for a more catholic state, it may also be seen, in the few persons rising up here and there to speak of a more com-

prehensive faith, or to handle questions of polity and doctrine in a more comprehensive spirit, that there are powers coming into the field, which possibly God has trained for the preparation of a new catholic age. Probably never until now has the world been ready to conceive the true idea of a comprehensive Christianity. Nor is it ready now, save in part. The idea itself is yet in its twilight, dimly seen, only by a few—by none save those who are up to watch for the morning.

Our object, in this article, is to say what we are able of a subject formerly so remote from the world. We confess that, in our own apprehension, we seem rather to stammer than to speak plainly. Still, as it is by stammering that we learn to speak, we go to our rudimental effort suffering no pride to detain us.

What we mean by comprehensiveness, or a comprehensive Christianity, may be illustrated, in part, from the manner and teachings of Christ himself, who is the Lord of Christianity. In nothing did Christ prove his superhuman quality more convincingly, than by the comprehensiveness of his spirit and his doctrine. He held his equilibrium, flew into no eccentricities, saved what was valuable in what he destroyed, destroyed nothing, where it was desirable rather to fulfil than to destroy. It is the common infirmity of mere human reformers that, when they rise up to cast out an error, it is generally not till they have kindled their passions against it. If they begin with reason, they are commonly moved, in the last degree, by their animosities instead of reason. And, as animosities are blind, they, of course, see nothing to respect, nothing to spare. The question whether possibly there may not be some truth or good in the error assailed, which is needed to qualify and save the equilibrium

of their own opposing truth, is not once entertained. Hence it is that men, in expelling one error, are perpetually thrusting themselves into another, as if unwilling, or unable to hold more than half the truth at once. And so if any advance be made, it is wrought out between battles and successive contraries, in which, as society is swayed from side to side, a kind of irregular and desultory progress is maintained. Thus if any human reformer had risen up to assail the tithings, washings and other tedious observances of the Pharisees, observances the more easy to regard as odious, because the men themselves were odious—a sanctimonious race of oppressors and hypocrites, who live by forming the public superstitions—this human reformer would have said, ‘away with you hypocrites, and away with your works. Let your tithings go, and, if you will do any thing right, come back to the weightier matters of judgment, mercy and faith.’ This Christ did not say. Detesting the cruelties and base hypocrisies of the sect, as he certainly did, he is yet able to see some benefit in their practices, some truth in their opinions. Therefore he says, ‘These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone’—comprehending, at once, the exact and the free, the disciplinary and the useful, offerings to God and labors for mankind. And the most remarkable feature in his sermon on the mount is the fact that, while he perfectly transforms the old doctrines and laws, he yet annihilates nothing. ‘I came not to destroy, but to fulfil—to bring spirit to form, extend the outward law to the inward thought, to fill out the terms of knowledge and the statutes of duty, but to suffer no jot or tittle of the law to perish.’ It is by this singular comprehensiveness, in the spirit of Christ, that the grandeur of his life and doctrine is most of all conspicuous. For by this it was that

be set himself in advance, most clearly, of his own and of all subsequent times. With men, if they ever attain to any thing of a comprehensive aim, it is only in what may be called the second age of the church or society, the historical and critical age. In the first age, they see truth; in the second they consider the seeings of others and their import. In the first age they regard the forms of truth as identical with truth itself; therefore they stand, every man, for his own form, having no choice but to live or die by it, and no thought, perhaps, but to make others live or die by it too. But in the second age, opinions become a subject of comparison, their laws are inquired after, their forms become plastic and are seen melting into each other. Under contrary forms, are found common truths, and one form is seen to be the complement of another—all forms, we may almost say, the complement of all others. But it was in no such philosophic and critical method that Christ attained to so great comprehensiveness. He found it rather, in the native grandeur of his own spirit. Speaking not as a critic, but as a seer, his simple seeing placed him thousands of years in advance of us, under all the lights of history. We seem now to be just beginning to spell out in syllables, and by a laborious criticism, that which Christ seized upon, as an original intuition.

But we must enter, if possible, into the more interior merits of our subject. It was given out a few years ago, by the distinguished French philosopher, M. Cousin, that there are, in philosophy, three possible schools of opinion, which must each have an era to itself—one that begins with the ideal, or absolute; a second that begins with the empiric, or conditional; a third which seeks to adjust the relations of the two, producing an ideal-empiric, or, as he would call it, an eclectic school.

Besides these three, he declares that it is even impossible to invent another. And the latter of the three he regards as the ripe school, one that will contain the last and fully matured results of philosophic inquiry. Now as human life lies between the infinite and the finite, as regards thought and the objects of thought, having contact in fact with both, there is certainly a show of truth in the theory offered. The history of opinions too may be made, without any great violence, to yield it a complexion of favor. Still it is easy to show in what manner other and more various oppositions may arise, and how they may be multiplied almost without number. They are, in fact, so multiplied, both in philosophy and in religious doctrine.

Having it, then, for our subject, in this article, to investigate, as far as we are able, the causes out of which religious oppositions arise, and to suggest the true remedy, let us, first of all, glance at the methods in which the Christian world fall into so many repugnant attitudes.

Doubtless it is true, in part, as M. Cousin suggests, that many of these repugnances are due to the fact that the *material* of thought is itself divided between what is absolute or ideal, and what is actual or empirical; so that a mind, viewing any subject partially, that is, from one pole, is likely to conflict with one viewing it from the other, and both with one who endeavors to view it from both poles at once.

But there are divisions, or repugnances, that are due as much to the *incomprehensibility* of the matter of thought, as to the twofold nature of its contents. The matter of thought is infinite in quantity, as well as ideal or empirical in quality. Hence it results that, as the minds of men are finite, they can only pull at the hem of the garment, and must therefore be expected to pull in different ways, accordingly as they fall upon the hem on one side or on the other.

For as the garment is, to each, nothing but the hem, in that part where he has hold of it, he is likely to make up his sect or school according to the view he has. But after long ages of debate, wherein every part of the hem is brought into view, then it is possible, certainly, for any disciple, who will look through the eyes of *all*, to form to himself some view of it, that is broader and more comprehensive.

Then again there are reasons for the rise of repugnant views, in thought and religious doctrine, which lie in what may be called the contents of *persons*. For it is not merely the contents of thought, but quite as much the contents of the thinkers, that give birth to contrary opinions and sects. We speak here of personal temperament, or of national temperament, working in the subject; of that which history has produced, or waits to have produced; of impulses, wants, all of which need as much to have their day and be tried, as the subject matter of thought itself. For example, the Pelagian doctrine of will, or self-supporting virtue, and the Quaker doctrine of quietism, may arise, in no small degree, from varieties of personal temperament. And since temperament is as much a reality as thought itself, what can ever display the manifold forms of a perfect and complete doctrine, unless temperament also is allowed to have its trial? So also prelacy was produced by historic causes, that is, by impulses and sympathies historically prepared. So also of independency or equality. It was something in the convenience of political power, or private ambition, or Christian experience, that produced these repugnant methods of organization, and set them in conflict. And now, since they are both set before the mind, as exhibited on trial, it is possible to decide, with greater confidence, on the method most congenial to the Christian scheme—per-

haps on a method that combines the excellences of both.

There is yet one more source of repugnant and partial opinion, which is quite as fruitful as the others; namely, *language*. No matter whether we speak of philosophic doctrine, or of that which is derived from revelation, every opinion or truth must come into the world and make itself known, under the terms of language. And all the processes of ratiocination, under which opinions are generated, are processes that are contained within the laws of language. But language can not convey any truth whole, or by a literal embodiment. It can only show it on one side, and by a figure. Hence a great many shadows, or figures, are necessary to represent every truth; and hence, again, there will seem to be a kind of necessary conflict between the statements in which a truth is expressed. One statement will set forth a given truth or subject matter under one figure, and a second under another, and a third, possibly, under yet another. The doctrine of atonement, for example, is offered, in Scripture, under a great variety of figures, and a history of the doctrine, up to this moment, consists, in a great degree, of the theologic wars of these figures, doing battle each for the supremacy. For as soon as any figure of truth is taken to be the truth itself, and set up to govern all the reasons of the subject, by its own contents as a figure, argument itself settles into cant, and cant is enthroned as doctrine. For cant, in rigid definition, is the perpetual chanting, or canting of some phrase or figure, as the fixed equivalent of a truth. And as most men who speculate, both in philosophy and religion, are not fully aware of the power of words, or how, if they place a truth under one word in distinction from another, it will assuredly run them into dogmas that are only partially true; successive dogmas in theol-

ogy or philosophy are perpetually coming upon the stage, and wearing themselves down into cant to die—in which, though they resemble themselves to the swans, it is yet with a difference; for the swans only sing when they die, but these sing themselves to death. The number of contrary theories that may be gathered round a given subject are limited, of course, only by the number of figures adjacent to it.

Instead, therefore, of the single cause for repugnant, or opposing theories, discovered by M. Cousin, we find as many as four classes of causes; one that lies in the twofold quality of the contents of thought; a second in the infinite quantity of the contents; a third in the contents of persons, including society and history; a fourth in the containing powers of language, as an instrument of thought and speculation.

On the whole, it does not appear that the theory of M. Cousin is sufficient. It is less defective as relating to questions of philosophy or philosophic systems, for which it was specially intended, but it is defective even here; for nothing is more certain than that the thoughts and speculations of men are shaped by causes which do not lie in the quality of the subject matter of thought. Far more extensively true is this in matters of theology or revealed religion, where so much depends on questions of fact or interpretation—questions that are not determinable by any philosophic or *a priori* method. Still the doctrine he advances that all questions of philosophy lie between two poles or extremes, is one that has a vast and almost universal application. So also of his doctrine that, inasmuch as men are after truth and not after falsehood, it may generally be assumed that under all extremes advanced there dwells a truth. And these will hold equally well in matters of theology.

Holding this view, it may seem

to follow also, as asserted by M. Cousin, that there can arise, about any subject or question, only three schools of opinion—the schools of the extremes, and a third school, which undertakes to settle their relation, or comprehend them in a common view. And perhaps there can not in any legitimate way. Still it will be found, in historical fact, that men do not always proceed in a legitimate way. Other causes act upon them, which do not lie in the subject matter of inquiry. As we see them in actual controversy, they describe a history which may be well enough represented by the five stages or modes which follow.

First comes up into the light one extreme and, with or without controversy, it is adopted. After a while a second school, looking the dominant opinion or practice in the face, begins to see that there is something wrong or false in it, and rises up as an assailant, to assert the second extreme. Now comes the war between extremes. The parties are certain, both, that they have the truth. They regard each other in their present half seeing state, as wholly repugnant and contrary. The war goes on, therefore, as a war between simple truth and falsehood, which no terms of peace can reconcile, and which permits no issue but one of life or death. Probably the new extreme will prevail, and the old subside into a secondary place.

Meantime, there is likely to appear a neutral school, made up of those who are disposed to peace, and deprecate war, and who can not escape the feeling that there is something extravagant or excessive, (as there certainly is,) in both the militant schools. These are the moderate men who praise moderate things—the wooden headed school, who dread nothing with so great reason as a combustion of any sort. Hence it is the real problem with them to divide distances, and settle them-

selves down as nearly midway between the poles as possible. Sometimes they are called in derision, men of the fence, but they call themselves, and more correctly, *neuters*, that is, *neitherers*; for the real study and problem of their school is negative. It is not to find the truth as a positive form and law, but it is simply to find a position halfway between the two schools before them — to be about as much and about as little one as the other. They are prudent, but not wise. They make a show of candor, without so much as a thought of the truth. But as men grow weary of controversy, and the passions that give zest to it for a time are seen to die out, and give place, at last, to a sense of disgust; as extremes held singly are seen moreover to bring a sense of defect and weariness by themselves, the neutrals are very likely to get their turn and become the reigning school. The public are sick—why must their ears be stunned by the perpetual din of controversy? So falling into the sick list of neutrality, one after another, the two schools of the extremes are gradually thinned away, and seem about to be forgotten. But for some reason it begins at length to be felt that there is a very peculiar insipidity in this neutral state. There is nothing sufficiently positive in it to waken a resonant feeling in the soul. Plausibilities have taken the place of truths, and the diet is too thin to feed the blood. After spending thus a whole age or generation midway between somewhere and nowhere, or rather between two somewheres, they begin to feel that neutralities, after all, are more sickening than controversies, and they are willing, possibly, to go back and resume the old quarrel of the extremes, if it is only for the health of the exercise.

There is also what is sometimes called a *liberal school*, which differs widely from the neutral, as having aims of a more generous quality.

For while the timorous neutral is engaged to settle his position midway between extremes, the liberal is extending an equal indulgence to both. The former is moved by prudence to himself, the latter by charity to others. The virtue of one is moderation, that of the other tolerance. One lets go the truth to consult distances, the other admits that possibly we are all too distant from the truth and see it too dimly to be over positive concerning it. Now most of the arguments and motives to liberality are of a reasonable and generous quality, and where the liberal spirit is connected with a rigid and earnest devotion to truth, it is a condition of health to itself and a mark of respect to others. But how easy is it to be indulgent to others, if first we are indifferent to the truth. And if liberality itself is made to be the virtue and hung up as the flag of a school, it is very sure to prove itself, ere long, to be anything but a virtue. Or if still it be called by that name, it will show itself to be the most unilluminated, most impotent and insipid of all virtues. Having no creed, in fact, save that other men shall be welcome to theirs—earnest in nothing save in vindicating the right of others to be earnest, counting it charity not to be anxious for the truth, but to be patient with all error, smiling indulgently upon all extremes, not caring how the truth may fare between them—the liberal school makes a virtue of negation, and freezes itself in the mild and gentle temperature it has mistaken for charity. The word *liberal* is in fact a negative word, there is nothing positive in it. And, as words are powerful, no body of men, however earnest at the beginning, can long rally under this word as a flag, without making it a sacrament of indifference, and subsiding, thus, into a state which involves a disrespect to all the sacred rights of truth. But as life can not long be

endured where earnestness is lost, so the liberalist will begin, ere long, to feel that his supposed charity does not bless him. And now he will gird himself again for war, seize upon some post and fortify it, and though it do not cover a half acre of ground, he will swear to die fighting for something, as better than possessing nothing.

Having now the schools above named before us, first the schools of the extremes, with their wars ; then the neutral or the liberal school or both, succeeding and bringing in an age of dearth that can not longer be supported ; we may see how a fifth school rises to complete the cycle and gather unto the truth, her own true catholic brotherhood. There rises up now a man, or a few men, who looking again at the two extreme schools, begin to ask whether it is not possible to comprehend them—that is to receive, hold, practice all which made the extreme opinions true to their disciples ? The very thought gives compass or enlargement to the soul in which it is conceived. It ascends, as it were, to a higher position, to look down upon the strifes of the race and use them as the material of its exercise, conveniences to its own final establishment and victory. In this effort to comprehend extremes, it offers no disrespect, but the highest respect, rather, to the great and earnest spirits that have stood for the truth and fought her battles, giving them all credit for their courage and devotion, and considering them, in fact, as the right and left wing of the field, which it now remains to include in one and the same army. It is in fact a disciple of the extremes, taking lessons of both, and ceasing not till it has gotten whatever good and whatever truth made their opinions sacred to themselves. In the endeavor to comprehend extremes, it comprehends also both the views of the neutral and the liberal schools. The neutral was sure

that there was some extravagance, some defect of equilibrium in the extremes, and this he thought to restore, by dividing distances and holding neither. The comprehensive school restores it by holding both and bringing both to qualify and moderate each other. The liberal saw charity perishing in the earnest battle of the extremes, and required of itself a more indulgent spirit. The comprehensive school finds not only a defect of charity, but, what is more, a real ground for charity, in the fact that both extremes are only standing for the two poles of truth ; earnest because they have the truth, and only quarreling because they have not breadth enough to see that they are one. In the comprehensive school it will be a first conviction, that all serious, earnest men have something in their view which makes it truth to them ; therefore that all serious, earnest men, however repugnant in their words, have yet some radical agreement, and if the place can be found, will somewhere reveal their brotherhood. Therefore they are not only to tolerate, but to love and respect each other. Nay, they are each to ask, what has the other, which is necessary to its own completeness in the truth ? And thus the comprehensive school, finding its liberality in the higher pursuit of truth, will have it not as a negation and exercise it not as a sacrament of indifference. It will be moderate without pursuing moderation, liberal without pursuing liberality, both because it follows after the truth, giving heed to all earnest voices, and bowing as a disciple to all her champions.

It is not our design, in giving out this distribution of schools, to place them all upon an equal footing. The first two and the last, the two extreme, or partisan schools and the comprehensive school *must* appear in their order—they constitute the necessary conditions of mental progress in the truth, and truth can not

find a complete and full development without them. The other two, the neutral and the liberal, do appear casually, or incidentally, and often hold an important figure in the real history of sects and opinions, and no sufficient view of the actual history of opinions can be given, without some reference to them. They may both be regarded, perhaps, as spurious modes of the comprehensive school, actuated by some dim and undiscovered sense of the fact that there is, doubtless, a higher, broader truth, which, if it were known, would reveal an aspect of extravagance in the partisan strife of the world. In this view, they may be looked upon as rudimentary efforts preparatory to the development of a true comprehensiveness. And therefore the proper dignity of a comprehensive effort, guided by intelligent convictions and fixed laws of criticism, could not appear, without some notice of the contrast between it and them.

Having it for our design, in this article, to recommend the comprehensive spirit in religion, we are tempted, first of all, to speak of it as related to character itself; for this is the radical interest of the subject, and the illustrations we may offer here will be familiar to all our readers, even to those who are unexercised in the higher abstractions of theology.

The endeavor to comprehend all antagonisms and hold the just equilibrium of truth is the highest and most ingenuous that a human soul can propose—one that God only can perfectly realize. Yet whosoever has but conceived such a thought gives some evidence therein of a resemblance to God, and he is, according to the measure of his success, a truly great character. A comprehensive character is, in fact, the only really great character possible among men. And, being that which holds the fullest agreement and sym-

pathy with God, it is one, we are persuaded, that is specially valued and cherished by Him. We shall find also, by inspection, that all the defective modes of character in Christian men are due to the fact that some partial, or partisan view of duty sways their demonstrations. Sometimes one extreme is held, sometimes the other, and accordingly we shall see that, excepting cases where there is a fixed design to brave the laws of all duty, the blemished characters go in pairs.

Thus one man abhors all prejudice, testifies against it night and day, places all his guards on the side opposite, and, as pre-judgments of some kind are the necessary condition of all judgments, it results, of course, that he falls into an error quite as hurtful and more weak, ceasing to have any fixed opinion, or to hold manfully any truth whatever. Another, seeing no evil but in a change of opinions, holds his opinions by his will and not by his understanding. And as no truth can penetrate the will, he becomes a stupid and obstinate bigot—standing for truth itself, as if it were no better than falsehood.

There is a class of Christians, who specially abhor a scrupulous religion. It is uncomfortable, it wears a superstitious look, and therefore they are moved to assert their dignity by venturing out, occasionally, on acts or exhibitions that are plainly sinful. And then when they return to their duty (which they are quite certain finally to omit) they consent to obey God, not because of the principle, but because of the importance of the occasion! In expelling all scruples, they have made an exile of their consciences. A man at the other extreme will have it for his religion to be exact in all the items of discipline, and will become so conscientious about mint, anise and cummin, that no conscience will be left for judgment, or mercy, or even for honesty.

Some persons are all for charity, meaning by the term a spirit of allowance towards the faults and crimes of others. Christ they say commands us not to judge; but they do not observe that there are things which we can see without judging and which, as they display their own iniquity, ought to be condemned in the severest terms of reprobation. Charity will cover a multitude of sins—not all. The dearest and truest charity will uncover many. Opposite to such, we have a tribe of censorious Christians, who require us to be bold against sin, who put the harshest constructions on all conduct, scorning and denouncing as surely as they speak. If they could not find some sin to denounce, they would begin to have a poor opinion of their own piety. These could not even understand the Savior, when he says, 'neither do I condemn thee.'

Some Christian professors are so particularly pleased with a cheerful spirit, and so intent on being cheerful Christians themselves, that they even forget to be Christians at all. They are light enough, free enough, —the longitude of face they so much dread is effectually displaced. Indeed the godly life, prayer, sobriety itself, are all too sombre for their kind of piety. Opposed to these we have an austere school, who object to all kinds of relaxation, and have even some scruples about smiling. A hearty laugh is an act of positive ungodliness. They love to see the Christian serious at all times. Their face is set as critically as the surveyor's needle, or they carry it as nicely as they would carry a full vessel. But there is a certain measure of sourness in all human bosoms, which if it can not be respiited by smiles, becomes an active leaven. The face that was first serious changes to a vinegar aspect, and this reacts to sour the sourness of nature, till finally it will be found that the once amiable person has become

nervous, acrid, caustic and thoroughly disagreeable.

We have a class of disciples who appear to sum up all duty in self-examination. They spend their lives in examining and handling themselves. They examine themselves till they are selfish, and extinguish all the evidences for which they look. They inspect and handle every affection till they have killed it, and become so critical, at length, that no feeling of the heart will dare venture out, lest it should not be able to stand scrutiny. Another class have it for a maxim never to doubt themselves. 'Let us do our duty,' they say, 'and God will take care of us.' So they delve on, confident, presumptuous, ignorant of themselves, guarded against no infirmity. But they might as well do nothing in the name of duty, as to go on with a spirit so ill regulated, and if they knew it, so very nearly wicked.

There is a class of disciples who especially love prudence. It is the cardinal virtue. They dread, of course, all manifestations of feeling, which is the same as to say that they live in the absence of feeling; for our feelings are the welling up of the soul's waters, the kindling of its fires, when no jealousy is awake to suppress them. If they are watched, they retreat to their cell—joy, love, hope, pity, fear—a silent, timidous brood, that dare not move. The prudent man becomes thus a man of ice, or, since the soul is borne up and away to God only on the wings of feeling, sinks into a state of dull negation. Then we have another class who detest the trammels of prudence, and are never in their element, save when they are rioting in emotion. But as the capacity of feeling is limited, it comes to pass in a few days that what they had is wholly burnt to a cinder. Then, as they have a side of capacity for bad feeling still left, new signs will begin to appear. As the

raptures abate and the high symptoms droop, a kind of despair begins to lower, a faint chiding also is heard, then a loud rail, then bitter deprecations and possibly imprecations too ; charges are leveled at individuals, arrows are shot at the mark, and the volcanic eruptions thrown up at the sky are proofs visible and audible of the fierce and devilish heat that rages within. This is fanaticism, a malicious piety, kindling its wrath by prayer and holy rites.

In these examples we have brought into view, extremes that are furnished principally out of the contents of persons. How manifest is it that each of these extremes, embracing its opposite, would rest in a balanced equilibrium on the two poles of duty, and be itself the wiser and the holier, for that which is now its mischief and its overthrow.

There are other classes of extremes affecting the character, which are more speculative in their nature. What endless war have we between the school of reason and the school of faith. But the truly enlarged disciple will somehow manage to comprehend both, considering it to be the highest reason to believe, and the highest faith to reason. One man places virtue in action, another in feeling. Possibly it is in a moral standing of the soul, to which it ascends between both—action inspired by feeling, feeling realized by action—thus in the moral liberty of the whole man. One class consider Christian piety to be a Godward and devotional habit. Another class are equally sure that God is pleased with us, when we do our duties to our fellow men. Thus we have pietism or quietism on one side, and philanthropy on the other. But the comprehensive word commands us to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before God—to love God and through him love our brother, to love our brother and to see therein that we love God. Some

are justified by faith, some by works. But as faith without works is dead, and works without faith are equally so, there are some who prefer to show their faith by their works, and quicken their works by faith, and thus to be alive in both. There is also a school of legalists, and a school of spiritualists. The former live without liberty, the latter without law. But the true Christian soul is free in the law ; for it is the art of love to hold a soul under discipline, and beguile it still of all sense of constraint. Some resolve all duty into self-interest. Others are equally sure that all self-interest is criminal. Possibly self-interest may offer motives, that will bring the soul up unto God and prepare it to such thoughts that it will freely love God and duty for their own sake, and thus go above self-interest. So one person is for experiences, another for habits ; one for sentiments, another for principles. But God is comprehensive, working *all in all*—only by diverse operations. A large body of Christians insist on a perfectly uniform exercise in religion. Another body are for new scenes and high demonstrations. But God, consulting both for uniformity and diversity, prefers to bring us on towards one, by means of the other.

So in all the possible views or aspects of Christian character, you will come nearest to what is great and Christ-like, if you seek to unite whatever repugnant extremes are before you—to be modest and yet bold ; conciliatory and yet inflexible ; patient in suffering, sharp in rebuke ; deferential to all men, independent of all ; charitable towards the erring, severe against the error ; at once gentle and rigid, catholic and exclusive, all things to all men, and one thing only to yourself. The more numerous and repugnant the extremes of character (excepting those which are sinful) you are able to unite in one comprehensive and harmonious whole, the more finish-

ed and complete your character will be.

We have dwelt thus largely on illustrations derived from the department of practical character, because the tendency of mankind to assume opposite poles or extremes is here so conspicuous, and a matter so familiar to observation. Our design is to get color, in this manner, for the more difficult branch of our subject yet remaining. Man is not one being in the practical life, and another in the intellectual or speculative. Indeed there is no precise line of distinction between matters of practice and matters of opinion; for practice moulds opinion, and opinion practice. And it will be found that in all the contrarieties of character just set forth, the contrariety observed is due to the fact that character and duty are seen at opposite poles, and shaped in this manner by opposite opinions.

Passing on now to matters of faith and doctrine, we shall see the same only more distinctly. And as all the extremes of practice go by pairs, so we shall find that sects and dogmas are set off in pairs about given points, and fighting each for its own opinion or pole—thus that all the Christian sects stand to represent, in some sense, all the Christian truths. Which, if we can manage to comprehend, as we know they are acknowledged and comprehended by Christ in the unity of his own body, then we shall complete ourselves in Christian doctrine, and realize the idea of a true Christian catholicity.

We do not, of course, maintain that there is no error in the Christian sects. A want of catholicity, or comprehensiveness, is itself error. To see any thing partially, or at one pole, is to see it insufficiently, thus in defective forms and proportions. Thus all sects and schools hold mixtures of error, created by only half seeing what they see. Besides they are all instigated, in part, by evil pas-

sions and blinded by false prejudices, so that they not only fall into error by half seeing, but sometimes by wrong seeing also. Still it will generally be found, if we set ourselves to a careful scrutiny of the tenet or opinion which is distinctive in a given sect or school, that there is some real truth in it, however repugnant at first view to us—something which makes it true to the school, and the school earnest in maintaining it. As a matter of fact too, we have almost never seen a dogma advanced by any body of men, however monstrous, which, if it were dissolved and viewed in its contents historically, would not yield some important truth.

Thus, among the first efforts of the church to frame a doctrine of atonement, the death of Christ is often represented, and especially by Irenaeus and Origen, as a ransom paid to the devil. No representation probably could be more abhorrent, when taken on its face, to the feelings of all modern Christians. But if we can have patience to withhold our judgment, long enough to take down the drapery of the language, or dissolve its figures, thus to separate the real truth of feeling they may have received, under a form of dogma so abhorrent to our speculative views of the subject; in a word, if we can accurately conceive their historic state of mind, when advancing this rude theory of atonement, the first which unilluminated reason had produced, we shall find no difficulty in allowing that they held a warm and living truth, under a form so badly misshapen.

No doctrine is sooner rejected, or more derided for its absurdity, than the doctrine of the real presence. But when taken with all the negations added, in regard to the sensible form of the elements in the supper, it would be difficult to show that any thing more is left than what every believing Christian ought to admit, viz. that the recipient of the

supper is to meet, therein, a grace which is above sensation, and feast himself in the participation of the divine nature. Out of this great truth of the presence, passing into a human philosophy, the doctrine of transubstantiation, and of a sacrifice, probably grew. The injuriousness of the doctrine is due, not to the fact that it contains no truth, but to the fact, rather, that the disciple is like to be confused and astounded as before a miracle wrought by the priest, and thus to miss of the truth. The exaggeration, or over-statement, smothers the truth contained. Meantime, is it not also possible, that the Protestant often misses the same truth, under the doctrine of Zuingle? He comes, we will suppose, to do an act, to use a symbol that will assist him to remember his Lord? But if he is wholly occupied with his own act, there is no communion. He is only magnetizing himself. Communion implies reciprocity, and if he may not and does not receive the real Christ, there is no reciprocity. If, therefore, Christ does not offer himself there to be received, by a presence above sensation, or if the disciple does not believe it, then he is blinded by his rationalism as the Romanist by his superstition. Two things are necessary to the Christian idea of the supper. An act of reception, which is an act of faith, and a matter to be received, which is a matter offered to faith. If the Romanist omits the faith, how often, both in practice and also in theory, does the Protestant omit the matter of faith. When both poles are united, when Christ the matter of faith is offered to faith, and faith receives the matter offered, then is the Lord's body discerned.

The Quaker doctrine of an inner light, however derided, contains a great and sublime truth. And, if it be taken as antagonistic to the doctrine that all true knowledge is derivable to the soul through sense, whether as occupied with nature, or

instructed by revelation, it might be difficult to say which is nearer to the truth. If one nullifies the word, the other nullifies the soul as the candle of the Lord. Or if the world is dark without Christ, so, if the light that is in us be darkness, how great is that darkness—even having Christ before us. Without the inner light, revelation can not certify its truth; for there is nothing in the soul to measure and discriminate truth. Without revelation visiting the soul from without, or through the senses and the understanding, the inner light of conscience and reason is provoked to no distinct announcement of itself. There is a divine Word in the soul's own nature, but it shineth in darkness and is not comprehended, till the Word becomes flesh and is represented historically without. And even then, the natural man dieth not the things of the Spirit, until the inner life of the soul is quickened to perceptiveness, by the inbreathing of God. The Quaker and the Scripturalist, therefore, are both right and both wrong—right in what they assert, wrong in what they deny. Unite the positive contents of both, and we have the Christian doctrine.

The same may be said, in substance, regarding the Absolute Religion of Mr. Parker; for this is only a modified Quakerism—a Quakerism whose inspiration lies in natural ideas and instincts, and not, to any extent, in spiritual gifts. Nor is any thing more true than that the soul is constituted for religion, much as he has represented. It is a great and divine truth also—one that revelation itself presupposes and actually affirms. But if Mr. Parker had taken pains to inquire why God has set us in a sphere of sensation, amid objects of knowledge and scenes of experience,—why he did not make us mere absolutes ourselves, in a world of geometries and bare intellectualities, he might have been led to suspect that the same reasons

which determined to this, might require also historic revelations and even miracles. For if it be needful to live in a phenomenal world, if the absolutes of the soul are nothing worth, until they are brought forth into actual discourse, and represented and mirrored in the objects and scenes of experience; if seeing and hearing, trial and work, are wanted to assist the absolute religion, why may not a Divine Word in the flesh be as useful as a Divine Word in the world? At the same time, Mr. Parker is not to be answered by denying the religious nature of the soul. If the soul were not a religious nature, the historic word would be worthless; and so, without the historic word, the religious nature, as a glance at the nations of mankind abundantly shows, will only baffle itself in its sins, and become a blinded and bewildered instinct.

Many persons are inexpressibly shocked by the Calvinistic dogma of unconditional election and reprobation, or of absolute decrees. But if they could suspend their mind, long enough to sound its depths and measure its real contents, they would find a great and holy truth enveloped in it, one that is even fundamental to God's empire, and necessary to the highest power of his government over souls—the same which has given to Calvinism a religious energy so peculiar. If it be understood that God enters into the actual historical world of men, to pick out, unconditionally, one for life and another for death, there is abundant reason to be shocked by such a doctrine. But if we go above the actual, to contemplate God, before the foundation of the world, as dealing with intelligibles, or possibles, perusing systems of possibles, foreknowing them and their contents, not as actual, or historical, but as intelligible; then instituting, or by a fiat of will actualizing the best and wisest, we shall see that, in put-

ting that best system on foot, he has made it certain that all the contents of the system will emerge, historically, in due time. He has done it by an absolute unconditional decree; for, if he had not put the system on foot, nothing in it would ever become a historical fact. And having done so, every thing in it will, and he will not be disappointed. What he saw in the intelligible, will emerge in the historical, exactly as he saw it. But not so as to exclude conditions in the actual. For the intelligible system he selected, was a system linked together by innumerable causes and relations; comprising activities to be exerted by Himself, laws pronounced, works of grace performed, acts and choices of the subjects as they, in their own freedom or self-activity, would determine; results of character and destiny, such as his own good activity, and theirs, both good and evil, would produce. And here is the great truth of Calvinism. Having this intelligible system before Him, with all its ingredients, conditions and results, gyd by an absolute decree institutes the system; which is the same as to say that whatsoever it contains, will come to pass—come to pass, that is, under the conditions, so as not to infringe upon the responsibility of any subject, and so as to justify Him and his goodness in all. In this grand truth of Calvinism, God's WILL becomes a reality. The world is felt to be in his hands. He asks no leave to reign. He reigns not blindly, or as a being baffled by unknown contingencies. Trembling before his sovereignty, we find it still a benign sovereignty, a rock of confidence and love. Unable to ascend above the actual and historical, the Arminian sees no other way to save the conditions of freedom and just responsibility, but to deny a truth so essential to God's government. Probably the Calvinist, equally unable to get above the actual, asserts his doctrine of divine

will and unconditional decrees, as holding under and within the sphere of actual history. One destroys the government of God, the other makes him a tyrant. And yet they are both asserting great and fundamental truths. Unite the Arminian and the Calvinist, comprehend both doctrines, and we have the Christian truth.

In these illustrations, it has been our object to show that, in dogmas regarded with the utmost repugnance, there is generally to be found some important truth, if only we have patience to look for it. In the same illustrations, we have also advanced the general purpose we have in hand, viz. to show that all the Christian truths stand in opposites, or extremes that need to be comprehended. That something of this kind is true in matters of natural science, is known to all. In the astronomic forces, in the chemical resolution of substances, in light and electricity, we discover nature lying between her poles, and science becoming a doctrine, when it comprehends them both. And, in this, we have only a symbol of what relates to mind and spirit, the doctrine of man and the doctrine of God.

Accordingly, the first thing to be done in theology is to reveal the poles, or the repugnant forms of truth. In all matters of moral judgment, or intellectual opinion, there must be something in the nature of controversy, to prepare the way. The elements to be combined or comprehended will thus be brought to light, and set up as distinct objects of contemplation. Then the man or the teacher that follows, holding himself aloof from the controversy, and looking calmly on as a spectator, to ask what do these combatants mean? what great truth have they each in mind, for which they are doing battle? will almost uniformly find that they have one, which is some how reconcilable with the opposite. Accordingly, there is

no one who has so great advantage, in arriving at the truth, as he who follows after a controversy, if only he has the independence of men and the implicit love of truth, necessary to improve his position.

Our churches, for example, have been recently agitated by a warm and earnest controversy in reference to the doctrine of spiritual regeneration. Ask what the antagonist parties are after, and it will be found that one is after the truth of divine agency and spiritual dependence, the other after the liberty and responsibility of the subject. In this case neither of the parties intends to deny what the other really wishes to maintain. Both assert our dependence, both our ability. But one a dependence which to the other destroys all ability; one an ability which to the other destroys all dependence. Never was there a better opportunity to settle the true comprehensive doctrine on this difficult subject, than when such a controversy going before has set up, in full view, the antagonistic elements to be united. But if we are to use the advantage offered, we must not be in haste to enrol ourselves as disciples or partisans. We must ascend to a higher and calmer position, where we may see at once, all the material offered us, and use it as material to be comprehended in a single view or doctrine. Then possibly we may find that a soul, under the bondage of evil, is able to renew himself in good in and through dependence—able to work because God worketh in him. It will not be said that he has a natural ability which means nothing, nor a natural ability which means that he can do all by himself. It will not be found that God must dispense an ictic grace *before* he can put forth any right motion, which absolves the sinner from any attempt; nor that he can regenerate himself, and is dependent on God only by consent or courtesy. But it will be seen

that he can do nothing out of God—any thing in God.

In the great question put in issue by the Unitarians concerning the Trinity, or the nature of God, it is difficult, in a single paragraph, to indicate the true comprehensive doctrine. But we are ready to express our firm conviction that the Unitarians will not be found to have stood forth in the maintenance of a pure error, when insisting on the strict unity of God. There was a kind of Trinity maintained, and still is, by many, which amounts to a practical triplicity, and breeds a mental confusion in the worshiper, that is both painful and hurtful. For this there was no remedy but to assert the absolute unity of the divine nature, and the position here assumed is impregnable. No doctrine of Trinity that infringes upon this can ever be maintained. Does it therefore follow, since God is one, that there is no conceivable tripersonality which can be vindicated? Others may thus judge, but for ourselves we have no difficulty in perceiving either the meaning, or the practical need of such a doctrine. For if there be a practical confusion in the triplicity held by many, there is a practical impotence in the bald philosophic unity and its representations, when rigidly adhered to, that is even more injurious to the life of religion. While our Unitarian friends, therefore, are reposing in all confidence on their impregnable doctrine of the divine unity, it becomes them to remember that if they are not reasoned out of it they may yet be frozen out, which is quite as bad. For without a Trinity subjective to us and filling the forms of the mind, God is necessarily distant, unconversible, and without any adequate warmth to sustain our religious vitality. Of this we feel quite as sure as we do of God's objective unity. If in saying this we seem to speak enigmatically, it is all we can say at present. We

only express, in addition, our confident belief in the possibility of a doctrine that shall comprehend all which the Christian world, on both sides of this great question, are contending for. For it would be singular—a philosophic anomaly passing belief, that all Christendom should have been standing for so many centuries, for that which, after all, is a pure phantasm, or hallucination. It is not in mankind to go after naked error in this way. Even when they stumble worst, it will be found that they have yet some semblance of truth.

In the question of old and new, perpetually recurring in matters of religion, we have the bigot on one side, asserting that nothing may be new, and the radical, on the other, that nothing shall be old. And if Christianity be a vital power in the church, both are true; for the new must be the birth of the old, and the old must have its births, or die. The future must be of the past, and the past must create a future. And which is more violent, to make a future identical with the past, or to make a future separate from the past, it may be difficult to say. We shall commonly settle on the right view, when we have schooled down the bigot and the radical, and compelled them to coalesce in some common result. And this Lord Bacon has done most happily, in his masterly comprehensive maxim, when he says—"We are the real antiquity." For in this he affirms both that all the wealth of antiquity is accumulated upon us, and that we have it as material out of which to make a future. If we cast off the lessons of antiquity, we are not wise. If we allow ourselves to be the mere dregs of antiquity, supposing that antiquity is to repeat itself in us, we are not wise. But we are wise only when we take note of the past, observe it carefully, study it respectfully, correct ourselves by its wisdom and its errors, and apply it

to fortify our own free judgment and use.

Nearly related to this is the question of church authority and of private judgment. Doubtless there is just so much authority, in the decisions of the past, as private judgment can reasonably accept. More there can not be. For to what do the advocates of church authority appeal, but to private judgment? They ask us, in fact, to give up private judgment, by an act of private judgment; in which it will be perceived they set open the whole question. And what do we, on the other side, in asserting private judgment, but allow it for granted, that there are reasons and authorities, under which we are to judge? Unless then we intend to say that the decisions and opinions of past ages, or of all ages, are to have no weight in determining questions and are never to turn the scales of evidence, there must be cases where we are concluded by authority of the past. And how far different is this from an appeal to private judgment, in favor of accepting all the past? for, if there be any one article of the past, which it can not accept, then it must be rejected, under the question of giving up our private judgment, precisely as if it were cited only as an evidence offered to private judgment. True it is maintained, on one side, that the church of the past has been illuminated by the Holy Spirit, so as to judge rightly, but this again can be decided only by an appeal to private judgment; and, if the advocates of church authority could allow a truth so manifest, their difficulty with the advocates of private judgment would soon be over. The sound reality of the question would then be stated, and our passions would not be smoking round a mock question that, having no significance, admits no settlement. Now we have it before us, on one side, to shut our eyes, and accept the law of the past, which, if we do, we use our will to

sacrifice our understanding—which is the most unmanly and basest kind of thralldom. Then, on the other, seeing that a tyrant is set up, who requires us first of all to put out our own eyes, we rebel, we even scout his impudent usurpations. So we have, on one hand, men who have lost their liberty; on the other, men who have lost their reverence. One class have their souls entombed under church authority. The other torn from the past are living as vagrant atoms in the open spaces of time, till the hunger of inanity and isolation kills them. Piety to the past, that is a free and filial deference, a rational and dutiful love, is the common want of both. Let the slave become a son, the libertine a son, the past a mother to both, and the quarrel is ended.

We might go on with illustrations of this kind, till a great multitude of the controverted doctrines of Christianity are seen yoked with their opposites, in friendly embrace—pantheism with theism, absolute religion with revealed religion, supralapsarianism with sublapsarianism, absolute decrees with self active freedom, salvation by grace with salvation by works, inability with ability, natural depravity with natural innocence, the bondage of sin with the freedom of the sinner. In all these repugnances, we have only the two poles of truth, which, if we can manage to comprehend in one and the same mental view, we arrive at the proper integrity of the Christian doctrine. Indeed we may lay it down as true, in general, that all the Christian sects in all their manifold repugnances of doctrine, are only concerned to exhibit the great elemental truths of Christianity. They all have errors, they all partially mistake, as it is human to do, and yet they all have some form of truth to maintain, which, when it is viewed comprehensively, and carefully distinguished under the forms of language, will fall into the same great scheme of Christian doc-

trine and assist to fit out the body thereof. So that when a man is able to comprehend the reality of all sects, casting away the unreality, he will be a full grown proper Christian man.

Dismissing here subjects of doctrine, we go on to speak of polities and organizations. Polities are not so much essential truths, or doctrines, as means to ends. They embody each some practical aim or idea, and offer each some valuable contribution to the comprehensive church of the future. Whether they will ever coalesce in any practical unity or mutual acknowledgment of each other, bringing in their treasures to enrich the common body, many will doubt; but, if a hope so beautiful must be renounced as visionary, we shall easily convince ourselves, by a study of their contents, that they have each some kind of wealth which makes their existence valuable, even now, to the world. Or, if some of them have no longer a sufficient reason for the maintenance of a distinct existence, it is only because they have already emptied their treasures into the world's history. Possibly such an opinion may some time be held of them all; for it may be that they are all designed to serve only temporary uses. And then, when they have all emptied themselves into history, and history contains the product of all, what forbids that a new church may emerge that shall comprehend the uses of all?

And if any such result is ever to appear, where sooner than here in these United States? Why else are we thrown together in this manner—Christians of all names and sects, living in the same neighborhoods, fellow citizens under the same laws, holding equal terms before the laws, united in business, intermarried in families? No such spectacle as this has ever been exhibited before, since Christianity entered the world,

and yet it seems to be the design of God that it shall, ere long, be so in all the other nations of mankind. The extension of liberty must bring the same results to pass every where. It seems to be God's purpose that all these multiform sects and polities shall either dissolve each other and lodge their contents at last in a grand comprehensive unity, or else wear themselves into similar shapes by their mutual attrition. And how else could a properly catholic state, which is the hope of us all, be constructed?

Forecasting such a possibility, let us glance at some of the sects and take a survey of their contents. And we begin with the Baptists, because they seem, in their very distinction as a sect, to stand for that which can never be accepted; for there is not the least probability, however confidently they may expect it themselves, that the whole church of God will, at any future time, become Baptists. How then, it will be asked, can they ever come into any comprehensive state, without renouncing that which alone gives them a distinct existence? But the question implies a view of the Baptist sect, whether held by themselves or by others, which is superficial and does not do them justice. Their real office, as a sect, does not lie in the fact that they are Baptists, but in that which makes them Baptists. And the fact is of little consequence in distinguishing the sect, save as it indicates a deeper and more significant cause, in their character. Taken as a class, the Baptists are the Christian impracticables, (not using the word in an evil sense,) individualists of the highest and most perfect degree. They are each a kind of church by himself, holding his minutest convictions as stern immovable fatalities. They are the intolérants, so to speak, of individualism; sacrificing to it communion and submerging under it, to a great degree, the social instinct itself. Assuming such a position they stand

off in solemn antagonism, against the intolerance of all social constraints, in church and state. Such manifestly are the men to be foremost, in asserting the sacred rights of the conscience. They did it in England, they did it here, they have done it every where. And now, at this present moment, nothing is wanted in Rome itself, and in all the nations still lying under ecclesiastical oppression, so much as the rising up of a race of stern individualists or impracticables, like the Baptists. In this view they have filled a noble office. They represent, in the most naked form, that which is the distinction of modern history—the full recognition of the individual man and the consequent sanctification of his rights and liberties.

And this we may say is the real truth of the sect, the practical idea which measures its value. This being accomplished among any given people, there is no longer any sufficient reason for its continued existence. And when the antagonism which gave it value and life is completely routed, we may reasonably doubt whether the anti-social, or impracticable spirit of the sect will not ultimately take away its own vitality. Indeed we seriously doubt whether a community wholly made up of Baptists could be molded into any settled and permanent form of social order, whether in church or state. They would fly asunder, just as now they withdraw from one another, constituting already as many as fifteen or twenty distinct sects. They are too unreducible, too much given to their individuality, to melt into any solid form of social unity. Besides, it is sure to be discerned also, as their mental breadth increases, that the mere question of baptism is one of too small consequence to make any dignified reason for the existence of a sect. It will be wonderful too, if it does not some time appear unchristian to many to forswear the communion of the whole

Christian world, for a pretext so slender. Possibly it may also be discerned that the reasonings applied to disprove the baptism of children are against the spirit of the gospel, against nature, hurtful to the family, hurtful to the church, proceeding from an exaggerated individualism, which takes away the Christian zest of life as a social ordinance, unsanctifies the homes and reduces humanity itself, (having Christ incarnate in its bosom,) to a collection of dry and repellent atoms.

The practical idea embodied in Congregationalism, or Independency, is different, though its history is, in some respects, parallel. It is less individual than the Baptist sect and more so than the Presbyterian. And in common with all the forms of Puritanism, it is too abhorrent of the past—too completely severed in feeling from the past; owing to the fact that it took its being, in a contest for the right to reform the errors of the past. Considered as a distinct form of polity, it stands for equality; not that equality which belongs to separate atoms but a *social* equality. It denies all priestly dignities, and suffers no lords over the heritage of God. It makes the church a brotherhood, equal to the work of self-government and responsible for the maintenance of its own order. Free toleration, liberty of conscience, it was sure to accept in due time, but it was too much intent, at the first, on social ends, to invent the doctrine. Its instinct was to organize a social state—IT MUST BUILD. Hence it had no thought but that the elements must coalesce, and if they refused there was no place for them. The fathers said they would have a free church and a free commonwealth, but it was to be free only to themselves. In their doctrine of equality, there was a germ of true religious liberty, but it was only a germ, and time must unfold it. But going forward under the impulse of a strong constructive instinct, the

new sect laid its foundations, built itself up into a solid republican order, and became the type of all that is distinctive in our institutions. Taken as a constructive power, it is to the Baptists what Massachusetts is to Rhode Island, or rather to what Rhode Island was in the social confusion of a former age. Wanting originally, in that which gave its practical value to the Baptist sect, it supplied an element which, in that, was deficient. Both are Congregational, but one has furnished the antagonistic spirit of liberty, the other its constructive social powers. One therefore has filled a more occasional office, the other a more permanent. For if Congregationalism dies and the name is lost, no frame of polity, in church or state, can hope for a general prevalence, which rejects the constructive powers of American history.

Presbyterianism is substantially one, in this respect—a younger brother, in our history, who has acted, for the most part, in conjunction with the elder, assisting the same results. Methodism has partially accepted the same principles of equality and self-government. It acknowledges no priesthood. The laity have an operative sphere and are sure, at length, to have a joint right in the government. Even American Episcopacy has sought to combine with prelacy a lay power, which represents the constructive basis of our institutions. The whole American church must some time do the same. Indeed there is a philosophic necessity that the comprehensive church of the future, if ever it shall appear, should conform to the constructive law of our institutions. Whether it have one order, or three; whether it be distributed into parishes or diocesan circles, it must be a brotherhood, officered by itself. The phantom of a priestly succession, distinct from the succession of the brotherhood of grace, a superstition cherished with so great in-

dstry in England, as the last hope of a priestly fabric outlawed by time, can never get possession of this nation. The constructive law of our history is against it, and it is a shadow too thin to battle with a force of so great solidity. Our philosophy can never accept it and it is too late in the day for a flat superstition to palm itself on the earnest belief of a nation like this. Not one in fifty of the Episcopal sect, in this country, earnestly believes it now. Many adhere to the sect in spite of it, and for reasons of a higher and manlier character.

We have barely touched upon the Methodist polity, but it gives a beautiful illustration, in its history, of a very important truth, viz. that any organization formed with a godly purpose and a desire to promote holiness of life and effectiveness in action, will be consecrated by Providence and perpetuated as a true church. Methodism was not organized as a church, but as an abnormal order in the church of England. It proposed, not to call out a dissenting body from the establishment, but to hold a position auxiliary to it; to stimulate its piety, supply its defects, repair the desolations left behind it by its heedless and worldly ministry. A more disinterested aim never actuated any human society. And such has been its efficiency, so manifest the good fruits it has yielded, that it has been obliged, as it were, to become a church and be perpetuated as such. God gives it the succession it did not ask, and holds it up to mock all successions that lie in tradition and not in duty. Methodism also illustrates another truth, viz. that Arminianism can be earnest in the godly life as well as Calvinism—a fact that God offers us to enlarge our charity and prepare us to a broader spirit of comprehensiveness. Were it not for this, were it known that Arminianism is synonymous only with deadness and spiritual inefficiency, many

would shrink from the comprehension of any one of its principles, as from the contact of death. Even now, when an age of dead Calvinism appears, it has become a kind of habit, the injustice of which many do not know, to call the profitless churches and ministers, Arminians. It would seem that a glance at the doctrines held on one side by these dead churches, then at our Methodist brethren on the other; devout, earnest, filling the new regions and the desolate wastes of the land with their fervent prayers and the fervent praises of men converted to God; would suffice to show us all, first that Calvinism may be dead, and second that Arminianism may be alive—possibly that a comprehension of both will be safer than to rest in either. Nor is there any sect in our country, we are sure, that will more readily sink itself in a comprehensive unity of all, than this which undertook, in England, to be auxiliary only to another, and which here rejoices in being a pioneer to all others. May it not be found also that the true comprehensive church will require an order of Methodism within itself, that all defects may be supplied, and all waste places visited?

The most obstinate impediment to a comprehensive church is to be found, we fear, in the Episcopal church of our country. There seems to be a kind of fatuity, if we should not rather say fatuity, in our American Episcopacy, which forbids it to see where its own interest lies, and also what is due from it to the common cause of God in the nation. It embodies in itself treasures of spiritual wealth that were reluctantly renounced by our fathers, and which many among us now would gladly accept, if the wood, hay, and stubble were removed. We could draw out a modification of its liturgy and also of its polity, which would make it inviting to the great body of Christians under other

names, and not a whit less satisfactory to its most earnest lay adherents; it only would not satisfy the egregious claims of its priesthood. They would be required to give up the superstitions they have gathered round their office, and interwoven with their priestly functions. If they could cease to Anglicize and consent to be Americans, if letting go their traditional grace, they could suffer a very little of true Christian philosophy, we would give them a divine right in their office, quite as efficient and far more valid than any which they cling to now.

Doubtless there is a truth, a great and momentous truth, wrapped up in their doctrine of succession; for the church of God is a vital body, and a vital body is one; so completely one, in fact, as well nigh to exclude the idea of succession. Its life is the life of God. This is its organic power, and it fills all ages, not as collective or successive aggregations, but as a corporate unity; sets us in immediate and living connection with the apostles and all saints of all ages, makes them venerable to our thoughts and us participants in their history. So that a church out of connection with the past is impossible, and a church that has lost the sense of its connection, regarding itself as being historically new, is a church chilled and benumbed by the fictitious isolation it assumes. But it does not follow that the vital unity of the church is constructed by an official succession of ministers or church magistrates, but the contrary; for then there would be a complete vital organism in the magistracy of the church, distinct from that of the general body of disciples, requiring us to believe that there is either no vital unity in that, or else that there are two distinct unities, one of the magistracy and another of the body, which is the same as to deny the unity of the church.

At the same time, there is an im-

portant truth also wrapped up in this idea of a magisterial grace, descending from one to another. It is only misconceived. The truth is this, that every officer in the church, as in the state, must be in it by a divine right, he must be clothed in his office by God. But it does not follow that he must be clothed in a certain way, *viz.* by a traditional grace of succession. In the days when kings and nobles succeeded by blood, and legitimacy was the same thing as a divine right to reign, it was natural that bishops, who do not succeed by blood, should think it essential to their office that it be derived by some kind of succession. Hence the figment of a bishop's grace was invented, and was readily accepted by the church; for how else could a bishop have any right, unless by some kind of tradition or inheritance? And how shall the Anglican church fortify itself now against the inroads of change, except as it consecrates this figment? Might not our American Episcopacy let go this fiction of legitimacy, and ceasing to nurse a superstition so feeble and void of dignity, trust itself to such divine right as it may have directly from God, as the head of all society? For it is God who clothes all office with a sacred right, an American President as truly as a British Queen. The designation may be by blood or by election; the investiture may be in one form, or another; still the magistrate is in by a divine right under God, as the fountain of all magistracy.

We are the more willing to apologize for our American Episcopacy, as adhering until now to this Anglicizing habit, because of the practically atheistic notions of government, which have hitherto prevailed among our people. But when we have had time to bring out the true theory of our government—election designating the ruler, God accepting and clothing him in his office—authority derived not from men, but from God,

the only conceivable fountain of authority—when our political philosophy has brought us to this, (for as yet we have no political philosophy that relates to any thing deeper than the forms of government,) then it will be more inexcusable to cling to the superstition of a canonical succession in the church. And why should not our American Episcopacy, embracing now a manlier doctrine, and marrying itself boldly to our American institutions, assist us in consecrating the divine right of our magistracies, instead of saying practically that God can sanctify a magistracy only through a line of legitimacy and a traditional investiture?

We can never have a comprehensive church, in this nation, that mocks the political order of the nation. Let our Episcopal friends consider this, and give to the considerations we have offered their true weight; and then they will be ready to offer their church to the nation, not as a foreign mannerism, not as an affront to our feelings and our history, but as Christ offers love to the race, paying tribute even to Caesar. We care not for three orders, or thirty, if only they bring us no superstitions and no lords over God's heritage. American Episcopacy is really nearer to American Congregationalism now, than it is to the state establishment of England, if only it could acknowledge what a rigid analysis of structure would certainly show. Let it thank American history that it is brought so much nearer to the true apostolic model. And if Puritanism has been a root in our history, let some honor be ascribed to Puritanism. Being sure also of this, that no church can unite itself to the love and life of a nation, which does not honor its fathers. Actuated by views like these, let our American Episcopacy pour itself into our bosom, as it may, with all its venerable treasures; neither suffer a doubt that all

it has, which is worth accepting, will be accepted.

We come now, last of all, to the Romish church, which, at present, is not, in any sense, an American church, but a Romish. It is foreign, not in its sympathies only, but in its organization—its head and ruling power is at Rome. What are to be its fortunes in this country, it may be difficult to foretell. It is perfectly manifest, however, that our institutions must communicate their spirit to its disciples, in such a degree, as to limit effectually the powers of its priesthood, and, in process of time, to require radical changes in its discipline. It can live among us only as it submits to be Americanized. At present, it has little moral power in our country, and we see not how it can well have more, until it suffers a closer conformity with our institutions. Were it left to stand alone, as a foreign religion, it would soon have less. But unhappily another church, maintaining its pretensions by arguments of a similar character, and associated with the name of England, mitigates the alien aspect it would have when standing alone, and imparts to it a show of character it has not in itself.

We regard the Romish church as a kind of monumental Christianity. Its rites, its creeds, its prayers, are all monuments; the shrines under which it has gathered the bones of the dead ages of the faith, are monuments; its cathedrals are representations, in stone, of their builders, and the grandeur of their Christian ideas. The saints' days are a practice in the mnemonics of history. The mendicant orders, monasteries and religious houses, still continued, after the spirit of life in which they rose has departed, are a pantomime all of death and the dead. So of the pictures, images, altars, amulets, relics, and priestly robes—every thing seen, handled and used, in the machinery of the

worship, is monumental. The incense has a Jewish smell, the vestals are a classic, the candles shed a pagan light. The whole immense framework of the religion is monumental. It represents, not the contents of the Gospel of Christ, but the history of that Gospel; showing how it has acted on the base elements of an idolatrous world and a corrupt human nature, and how they, in turn, have acted upon it. The good and the evil, the holy and the base, the charities of saints and the extortions of sin, the pure breathings of the just and the cruelties of power, trophies of faith and scars of wrong, gentile prejudices, pagan philosophies, gods baptized—every thing that has been since the Lord's ascension, all that men have done, out of an evil or a good heart, to build up his religion, is represented and embodied. The power of Christ is visible; in one view the structure is a memorial of his truth. Quite as visible is the power of evil. It is such a fabric as man builds, when he blends himself and the social delusions of his race, with the heavenly truth he will consecrate.

And yet, if we regard it as the design of God to connect the Christian future with the Christian past, by means of Romanism, how manifest is it that Romanism is what it should be. It garners up the life of the dead ages, as it gathers the bodies of the saints under its shrines, and bears them, in palpable show, through dark ages of sense and oblivion, to connect with the living thoughts of a more remote and more intelligent future. For though we may shrink from any thought of union with its baser contents, we shall embrace with the livelier and healthier reverence, on that account, all it contains of sanctity and truth. We shall see Christ straggling through it, as the sun through clouds. The righteous good of the past will appear in it, as in a dark and solemn tragedy, to be embraced with tears.

Great truths prevailing still against long ages of superstition and perverse speculation, as if unable to die, will shine forth in it the more gloriously, that they have proved their divinity. Things that move us by their sanctity and grandeur, will move us the more deeply that things base and offensive, always at hand, throw us into a maze and mix our reverence with disgust. Protesting against the human, we shall be the more impressed by what is divine.

But this, we regret to say, is not yet the happiness of Protestantism. The throes of the Protest has been so severe, and the consequent antagonism so intense, that a kind of horror, which absorbs all discriminative thoughts, separates us from Romanism and it from us. As Protestants, we seem to imagine a new beginning of Christianity. We assert a future seemingly disrupted from the past, and Romanism confronts us with a past disrupted from the future. And this is a condition of death to both; for every social body, whether civil or Christian, is of the past and for the future, and can not properly live, save as it connects with both.

What now we need is this; being delivered of the mutual horror, which has thrown both great divisions of the church asunder and been a wall of unreason between them, we must dare to look, one at the other, with eyes of deliberative inspection. And thus we shall be drawn gradually towards comprehension; one to unite with the Christian past, the other with the Christian future; the old to be purified by the new, the new to be hallowed and made venerable by the old. Is not such a process already begun? What signifies the new sympathy, which now exists, between the Romish state and the British government—a sympathy strong enough even to countervail the influence of Austria? And what is the import of the cheers for Pius Ninth, that

are rolling back upon Italy, from this democratic and Protestant people? And what is to be the necessary result of the spread of intelligence and of popular freedom, the growth of commerce, the rapid intercommunications of travel, and the universal intermingling of sects, which are sure to arise, on the future prevalence of liberty? The laws of society seem to prophesy here, and what do they tell us? Let no one imagine the impossibility of any such thing as a gradual approach, or even a final coalescence of the two forms of religion. If a Grotius and a Leibnitz maintained, in their day, the possibility of a reconciliation and a final comprehension, laboring earnestly to accomplish it, we may well enough risk any sentence that may be passed upon us, for cherishing the same thought now.

Unhappily we are accustomed only to speak of the differences between us and the Romanists—not of our agreements. Probably most Protestants would be surprised by the results that might appear, on a rigid comparison of our doctrines—so many are the coincidences, on points generally considered to be of the first consequence. And where some repugnances exist, a still more comprehensive scrutiny would often show that one is but the complement of the other. Elements also in the Romish polity, which we regard with unqualified repugnance or even abhorrence, will sometimes be found, when viewed historically, to have served uses so important, as to allow a mitigation of our judgments. We just now spoke, for example, of the monastic institutions, in terms that are well enough adapted to their present merits. But, in their origin, they were scarcely more than a natural development, or outward expression of the unworldly spirit of the Christian life. And of this they stood as a living symbol before mankind—setting

forth, in visible show, the antagonism between this world and the self-crucifying spirit of a life of faith. And as every sort of truth has been maintained by some extreme view of it, we need not scruple to allow that the unworldly nature of the godly life was more distinctly impressed on the minds of men, and is also more seriously apprehended even by us, by means of the ascetic, or monastic institutions. For we can not definitely tell what causes in the past have assisted to construct our own views and sentiments, or detect the secret chemistry of history by which they have been shaped. In short, we may well doubt whether, if Christ had left the world and these institutions had not arisen, the deep and awful chasm between the life of this world and the life of faith would ever have been practically set open, to human apprehension, as it now is. If, then, we do not prefer, just now, to commence building monasteries, or praising the sanctity of the living monks, it should comfort us, if we can find any inlet for respect, in the history of their origin.

The ecclesiastical supremacy of the Pope, and the stern political unity of the church under him, are quite as little respected by us, as they can be, but even these may yet be viewed in a similar light. The Romish church glories in the word *catholic*, understanding however, by that term, nothing different from a universal polity. It is not a world-religion, but an iron ecclesiasticism for the world—the only possible church, thus and therefore the catholic church. Under this formal error, it represents and holds before mankind a great and holy truth. It symbolizes unity and universality. And was it not necessary, when the free mind of the Protestant world fell off into contesting bodies and scouting parties, flying hither and thither in quest of truth, that some consolidated body should remain, to

hold itself up as a symbol of the catholic unity, and recall the mind of the discursives to that which is the only proper aim and last end of their inquiries, a true catholic unity—that which is never to be forgotten, always to be longed for, and, as soon as may be, to be realized. For, while Romanism stands for unity, and holds up its symbol, it has not yet conceived the idea of a true catholic church. No church is catholic, simply because it includes the human race; it must include them in the truth—it must comprehend them only as it is itself comprehensive. Hence there is implied, as a necessary condition, so much of disintegration, as will start a discursive process and bring out all the antagonisms involved in a complete and many-sided view of the truth. For this many-sided view is not the view of any single man or body of men. God has it, for the absolute truth is in Him. We have it not, save by manifold experiment. Rome assumes that it has even absolute truth, without experiment, and, in that right, challenges the assent of all mankind. But this is only to claim a universal application for that which is itself partial—which is not catholicity. True catholicity offers a universal doctrine, and for that seeks a universal application. The first problem is to find the universal doctrine, a problem which Protestantism is faithfully engaged to solve. For it is remarkable that, while the Romish church holds out the formal type or symbol of catholicity in its discipline, Protestantism only supplies the agencies by which catholicity may be realized. By this only, in its free and discursive working, are brought to light and set up for distinct apprehension, all the elements to be combined in the settlement of a universal or complete body of truth. Romanism holds the mold of unity, and we are trying to fill it. And when the comprehensive process is

completed, by which the material we offer is brought into a common result, a true catholic church will appear—a church including the free mind of the world, because it represents the free mind of the world. All the views of all ages and schools being combined in a comprehensive result, that result will be the nearest approximation to the absolute truth of God—thus a fit ground of catholicity.

That the whole Christian world, however, will ever fall under any form of strict ecclesiasticism, is hardly to be expected. A machinery so cumbrous could hardly be supported, and it would offer incentives to human ambition, more insupportable than the machinery itself. The Romanist will, just now, think otherwise. Arnold and the Chevalier Bunsen will prophesy a “church of the future” whose organic polity is national. We republicans may imagine the same, only that the civil power will not intermeddle, save as it offers a friendly protection to the church, repaid by its sanctifying presence and the union it consecrates between the public life of the nation and God. Enough that the church, in all lands and under whatever diversities, will know itself as one, in common works, a common faith, and an accordant worship—the body of Christ on earth, the fullness of him that filleth all in all. And, having come to this, it will be strange, if it should not sometimes gather its ecumenical assemblies—not as convocations of state and church dignitaries like those of old time, deputed to legislate over the faith; but assemblies of the friends and ministers of God, convoked to speak of things pertaining to the kingdom, and worship together before the King. And if those magnificent piles, erected to God by the men of past ages, should some time hang their arches, like skies of stone, over the assembled messengers of the world’s churches, and shake with

the sound of their ecumenical hymn, it will then be judged that the ancient builders piled these holy structures for a purpose worthy of their grandeur. Assembled thus in the grand cathedral of the North, it will not be forgotten that Protestantism and Romanism assisted both together in piling up so vast a fabric, and then the meaning of what was once a conjunction so strange will be solved. The “Three Kings” then will sleep as consecrated figments in their shrine, blank nothings, lost to thought, before the King of glory. Or assembled where a Borromeo sleeps encased in gold and gems, a real and true saint of the past, the past will be there, as a living power, repelled by no disdain, welcome to all hearts, and breathing into all a spirit of conscious unity with the buried just of all ages and climes. We are willing too that St. Peter’s should witness a convocation like this; for then the true idea of the catholic church will have arrived at Rome. And if it may, for one such occasion, be accepted as the metropolis of the Christian world, edicts and bulls will no more be its delight; the tiara will pass to the head of the King, where it belongs; offerings holier than all incense will fill the place, and the grand *misere-re* of the nations, poured out as a wail for sin, will melt them into a fellowship so lowly that human dignities will be forgotten. And then we can not object if the Latin prayers, which embody the worship of past ages, should find their legitimate use, as a common language of devotion, for the assembled tongues of mankind.

In offering these thoughts to the public, we are well aware that some may be scandalized or alarmed by their free spirit. But such will relieve their apprehensions, if they consider that we ask no compromise of opinions and do not even speak of liberality as a special Christian vir-

ture. We simply require it of all Christians to look for the truth, and the truth only. And if we require them to look beyond themselves and across their own boundaries, we see not that there is any thing specially frightful in this, if they look for nothing but the truth. Or if we prepare a previous conviction, in their minds, that there is somewhat of truth in all Christian bodies, does any one doubt that there is? And if it should happen that all these bodies look upon the truth on a side peculiar to themselves, what harm can it do us to pass round and look through their eyes? The method taken by the late Evangelical Alliance, at London, was truly a dangerous method and closely allied to licentiousness; for it chose out only common truths in which all the parties could agree, and consented to let all other truths pass into shade as of minor consequence. We recognize, contrary to this, the great principle that truth is a whole and is to be sought only as a whole—any where, every where and by all means. Let no one fear the debauching of his Christian integrity in so doing.

Others probably will look upon our labor, in this matter, as a useless expenditure of breath, and the hope we encourage as altogether visionary and romantic. It would be, if we held the expectation that the church of God is ever to become a political unity. Or if we proposed to the Christian sects to come together and work out a comprehensive unity, by any deliberative effort, in the manner of compromise and composition. Or if we looked for the realization of any such result as we speak of, by any given method, within any given space of time. Our object is simply to set before the Christian sects the comfortable truth that our antagonisms are, to a great degree, comprehensible—parts only or partialities, having each their complement in all

the others. Thus to beget a more fraternal feeling and soften the usuries and prejudices that hold us asunder. Thus to set all thinking minds on an endeavor after the broadest and most catholic views of truth, in the confident hope that God will thus enlarge their souls, draw them together, towards a more complete brotherhood, and finally into a full consent of worship. This, if we rightly understand, is what the Scriptures mean by seeing eye to eye. We now see shoulder to shoulder, but when we can look into the eye, every man of his brother, and see what he sees, we shall be one.

And if any one asks, when shall these things be? we may well enough refer him to the geologists for an answer. For if God required long ages of heaving and fiery commotion to settle the world's layers into peace and habitable order, we ought not utterly to despair, if the geologic era of the church covers a somewhat longer space of time, than we ourselves might prescribe. Enough for us that we show the laws of commotion and the methods of final pacification. Enough for us that the views we have advanced, if accepted and held by our fellow Christians, will be found to contain the philosophic causes of a better day, drawing us all into a closer assimilation and, as sure as causes must have their effects, into a final embrace in the truth. Confident of this, and leaving times and seasons to God, we do not seem to propose to the world unpractical schemes, or romantic expectations.

This discussion we have already protracted beyond our ordinary limits, but the magnitude of the subject must be our excuse. There is yet a whole branch of it remaining untouched, and one that would require a volume to give it a sufficient representation. It is this—to exhibit the laws and conditions under which the comprehensive process we speak

of may be conducted to its results, with the greatest certainty and expedition. All we can do here, at present, is to offer a few suggestions.

And, first of all, there needs to be a more comprehensive character formed in individual Christians. We must have a piety not of "our church," or "our catechism," or "our baptism," or our "Christian democracy," but a piety measured by God himself. We must look upon the comprehensive character as a Christian attainment. Such was the character of Christ, and therefore we must be as sure that he will have it formed in us, as that he will bring us into his own image. God himself too, is a comprehensive being in His character, so that coming unto Him, in the closest and most intimate union of spirit, which is the very idea of Christian piety, we must endeavor to partake of that quality which most distinguishes Him. For it is not some better philosophy generated in our understanding, that can work out, by itself, the process of which we speak. We must have a better philosophy in our heart and spirit, and this we must draw from God. We shall attain to no true comprehensiveness, except as we find it in God; in the holier love which melts away our prejudices, subordinates our human passions, expands the narrowness of our fallen nature, and makes us partake of the divine nature. This will universalize, first, our heart and, through that, gradually, our understanding. We shall have a single eye, when we have a simple, godly heart. A really comprehensive spirit, one all devoted to truth, stretching itself to contain all truth, as seen by all Christian minds, must be a religious spirit. Clearing itself of all human trammels, it must go up unto God himself; for nowhere short of God do the lines of truth meet and come into harmony, so that a mind may comprehend them. In Him, too, as we certainly

know, all our sects and divisions melt into unity. He is not the God of our sect. We dare not say it or think it. We tacitly admit that He holds some broader view, which is also, and for that reason, juster than ours. We do not doubt that he looks upon us all as diminished atoms of intelligence, ranging in His infinite realm of truth, fixing here and there, upon our points of doctrine, and regarding each the field that lies within his narrow horizon as the whole field—repugnant therefore, as between ourselves, but still in radical harmony, as before Him. To such thoughts we are to accustom ourselves, to consecrate them in our prayers and nourish them before Him, by a more conscious and habitual exercise. And if our piety does not enlarge as in this manner, we are rather to repent of it than to bless ourselves in it. But if God be in us, enlarging us by His own measure and causing us to receive of His own greatness, then shall we cease to be straitened in ourselves, and be able to comprehend that length and breadth and depth and height, which it is the prerogative of His saints to do.

It will help us also to remember that, as men or human creatures, our tendency is to err by narrowness and partiality, never by completeness or comprehensiveness. We are not only finite, but we enter into life only as rudimental beings, here to be filled out into proper men. We are to study, reflect, observe, rectify errors, then to rectify rectifications, and thus to fill out the character of sons of God. Children, we observe, always go for extremes: They *apprehend* what they may, but in our sense of the word, *comprehend* nothing; and a very preponderant number of our race seem never to get beyond their childhood in this respect. Our very finiteness, struggling after rest in the infinite, is obliged to seize on single points, and these glimmering points we take

for suns, partly because they are our seeing and partly because they fill our vision. We are thus occupied, for the most part, with half-seeing. And having found some pole of truth or of duty, we go to war for that, as if our half truth were entitled to fill and occupy the universe. Then again our passions carry us away yet farther, like a very great sail upon some feathery skiff, which the gusts drive hither and thither, and force upon the shallows when they will. The pride which says 'this is my truth,' or 'our truth,' opinions held more firmly by the will, because they are so dimly seen by the understanding; the lust of power, the fanatical idolatry of sect, all the venomous spirits that hover in the steam of our carnal hearts, conspire to narrow even our piety itself. Evil is a perpetual astringent in our souls, and we can get no breadth, save as we mortify and crucify ourselves. These are truths which every Christian man must regard more attentively, than has yet been done, in any former age. They must enter into our practical life. We must habitually suspect ourselves of limitation. We must find the sect spirit in our nature, keeping close company with our sins and coiling itself also, as a serpent, round the body of our piety. And when this latter grows exclusive and repugnant, walling itself up to heaven in its righteousness, we must have it for a maxim that we are narrowing ourselves by the measure of our sins.

Furthermore, it will be of great use, if we have some philosophic view of life and its appointments, that accords with God's design therein. He has put us down in this many-sided world, where all manner of contrary and controversial forces are pushing us hither and thither, that He may bring us into all possible views of truth and duty, cure our half-seeing, fill out our otherwise partial measure, and make

us as nearly complete, as it is possible for us to be. All that we see, hear, experience, in this multifarious world of struggle and debate, is undoubtedly meant to enlarge the comprehension of our mind, our principles, feelings, hopes, charities. Neither let any one shrink from such a thought, as one that is akin to laxity or licentiousness. There is a kind of liberalism, as we have said, which is but another name for indifference to the truth. With such a spirit the comprehensive soul has no feeling of sympathy. It is, in fact, the type of character most of all devoted to truth, regarding it as the brightest beam of divinity that shines into our world. Therefore it reverently seeks the truth in all minds irradiated by its light, separates it from the errors with which it is blended, sanctifies it as holy and dear to God. On the other hand, if we speak of the partisan classes or schools, sometimes called illiberal, they who gather about some pole of doctrine, stiff for their particular sect, impatient of the least departure from it, how manifest is it that these would rather die for half the truth, than for the whole. But the comprehensive spirit seeks to comprehend all repugnances, and lose, if possible, no shred of truth, wherever it may be found. Actuated by this lofty spirit, in which it resembles itself to God, it listens to all voices, searches out all forms of doctrine, proves all things and holds fast that which is good. Let no one fancy that he finds, in history, examples to deter us from the indulgence of such a spirit, as if it were the omen of a licentious age; for the history of man has never yet offered an example of the kind. There have been many attempts, in the Christian world, to bring about what is called, in the history, a comprehension of sects and parties. And the best men of the church have been forward in them. Baxter, Howe, Dr. Watts, Lord King, Til-

leton, Patrick, and others of the highest distinction in our English race, have conceived the idea of a composition of sects, and labored in their time to bring it to pass—labor-ed of course in vain; for they conceived no other method of comprehension, than one that is to be realized immediately, by an act of consent. Their effort was to settle the church by concession, compromise, and a moderation of extremes, not to prepare the souls of all disciples, by a gradual process of enlargement in the truth. Our Episcopal friends, too, sometimes delight to call their church "The Comprehensive Church," gravely showing how many varieties of faith may be quietly harbored, and have been, under its convenient ambiguities! We propose a method somewhat different from all these, and one, we think, which is as much more practicable, as it is less dangerous and farther removed from licentiousness.

At the same time, while we speak of it as a less dangerous method, we can not deny that it requires a much higher courage and firmness of spirit; for it lays upon every man, as an individual, to begin with himself and trust his opinions to a law or process, which is higher than the law of any sect or school. And it is scarcely possible that one who is accustomed to handle all the great subjects of religious inquiry, in this method, and to work his mind by the process it prescribes, should not become a generally suspicious character. But he must content himself with the verdict of the future, not doubting that a spirit so ingenuous will some time be as much approved by his fellow Christians, as it certainly is by God himself. Meantime, while reating himself in this manner on the truth of his own intentions, he will probably find also that he is delivered of an affliction which is the necessary torment of all mere partisans, dwelling in an element of composure which more

than repays the distrusts of his sect. The sectarian or partisan is the man of a part, one who measures himself by the contents of his sect, and not in reality by the truth itself. And as every partial view must have its antagonist, he is doomed to undergo a perpetual anxiety for his position. For, regarding it as the very truth itself, the complete truth of God, when he sees it assaulted by some adversary, as it certainly will be, he is filled with distressful anxiety lest the very foundations of the Gospel should finally give way or be corrupted. But the comprehensive method assists one to look on the two adverse parties as half-seeing men, who, if they see the whole truth between them, have yet the disadvantage that they see nothing as a whole. It is as if one saw the centrifugal and the other the attractive force of astronomy. One fears that the worlds will fly asunder beyond all fellowship, the other shudders lest they rush into a grand heap of ruins in the center. But the man who can comprehend both forces, in a scientific view, rests in comfort on the balanced order of the worlds, knowing that nothing can ever disturb the sweet influences of Pleiades, or burst the bands of Orion. In the same way it will ever be found that the men of a part or a sect are an uncomfortable and anxious race, living in perpetual panic, as if God's realm of truth were just about to dissolve, because their truth is threatened by another which, for some reason, will have advocates as earnest as they. But there is calmness, comfort, courage and rest for any comprehensive soul, knowing that if all together succeed, they will only suffice to fill out the measures of divine truth.

We have spoken already of language, as the fruitful source of contrary opinions and sects. If our schools of theology could, by three years of exercise, get into the minds of their pupils a right understanding

of this one single matter—the relation of a thought to a word—they would do more to quicken their intelligence and prepare them to a skillful resolution of the great questions pertaining to religion, than is often done by their whole course of discipline. This of itself would be the fruitful seed of a great and powerful theology. This only can open a true interpretation of Scripture, such as will suffice for a settlement of Christian doctrine. The Scriptures are the truth of God under the forms of language, and subject to its laws. No other book contains a system of truth so complete and comprehensive as the Bible, and for that very reason it combines all repugnant modes of statement. Viewed in its forms of language, without descending into its interior meaning, it is the most contradictory of all books. It is the product of all ages, and represents all kinds of mental habit. It views every subject of truth and duty on every side, and sets it forth at every pole. It offers thus, to a perverse or insufficient interpretation, material for every sect. Logically treated and without any power of insight deeper than logic, sects are its legitimate products. We hear it said on every side, that there are no ‘isms’ in the Bible. Rather should we say, which is the real truth, that all manner of ‘isms’ are in it—comprehended there, finite in infinite, as we ourselves in God. Therefore only is it a complete and universal code of truth, worthy of its author. When the Christian scholars are able to distinguish between the forms of truth and truth itself, receiving the latter without being enslaved by the laws of logic enveloped in the former, the true catholic doctrine will be seen and the sects will disappear and die. Sooner they can not.

It is of the highest consequence also that we should understand the true import of the Christian history, and discover what duty it has pre-

pared for us. We mourn over the controversies and contentions which, up to this time, have rent, as we say, the unity and peace of the church of God. Many minds have lately been occupied with a peculiar grief on this account. See, they say, into how many sects and schools the body of our Lord is riven! And, if we look at the evil passions and bitter strifes involved, it is truly a mournful sight. But controversies must needs arise; in our view controversies were needed, else the manifold extremes of truth could never appear. It was necessary for the great champions to gird on their armor and take the field. It was necessary to see behind us a long line of militant ages, smoking in the dust of controversy and causing the air to ring with the blows of their valiant encounter. So of the sects that have multiplied upon us in these last ages. All these are but the preliminary work, necessary to be done in the trying out of God’s truth. In one view, there have never been too many controversies, and are not now too many sects; for taken together they are wanted, all, as a grand exhibit or practical display of the manifold extremes of truth. The first ages could not take up the comprehending of opposites, until the opposites were set forth; but they did what they could, they set them forth. And now, in these last times, the result is to appear.

What then is now to be done? What does God require of us? Controversy? No, it is generally agreed that we have worn out controversy. What then? Must we learn to hold opinions more loosely, to be patient with error, and content ourselves in it? No, persecution itself were a dignified compliment to God’s truth, in comparison with any such inanity as that. Do we then want a grand world-wide Alliance, in which all Christians will agree to agree, or if they can not do that, to controvert harmoniously? So many

have thought, and they appear to fancy that when the Christian sects are strung together thus, like bells without a tongue, they will ring the world a concert by their external impact. Doubtless it is well, if they only meet to pray together, and blend their hearts in communion before God. It is in itself a beautiful sight, and quite as beautiful in what it indicates—the fact that now, at last, a comprehensive brotherhood in Christ has become a want. That want is above all things to be nourished. And being nourished, how shall it be guided to the attainment of its object? Not by selecting from the contents of our sects, and building up a union in diminished quantities of conviction. Every bell must have a tongue and a voice of its own. What we need is enlarged quantities of conviction, fullness of truth, not a compact based on half the quantity possessed by us now. We must take up the conviction that we do not all together contain more than the truth, and the endeavor must be to end our strifes by such a kind of enlargement as will comprehend all our antagonisms, and bring us into the essential unity of truth itself. We must have it as a settled conviction that in almost every form of Christian opinion earnestly maintained, even those which are often regarded as pure error, there is yet some element of truth, something which makes it true to its disciples. Then, laying aside

all malice, our schools must go into the language, one of another, asking what makes it true to the school maintaining it, and thus we must proceed till all our antagonisms are sifted, and every school has gotten to itself the riches of all. Or, better still, admitting each that our wisdom is not perfect, that the truth we hold is only partial truth, we are to cherish the want of something more perfect. And then, ceasing to insist that others shall receive and justify us, we are to ask what have they which is a want in us? What views of theirs, qualifying ours, would render them more valuable to us? What contribution, accepted of them, would make us more complete in the riches of the Gospel? Thus let Calvinism take in Arminianism, Arminianism Calvinism; let decrees take in contingency, contingency decrees; faith take in works, and works faith; the old take in the new, the new the old—not doubting that we shall be as much wiser as we are more comprehensive, as much closer to unity as we have more of the truth. For then, as all are seen embracing and comprehending all, we shall find that we are one, not by virtue of any concert or agreement, but as the necessary consequence of our completeness in the truth. To be strung together in outward alliances will now be a vain thing; for all Christian souls will ring in peals of harmony, as a chime that is voiced by the truth.

---

#### POST-OFFICE REFORM.

Five years ago, before the subject of a reform in our post-office system had excited public interest, we discussed the question at length in the first Article of this work, and gave some account of the new system which has been so successful in Great Britain.

Two years later, the conviction had become well nigh universal in the northern states, that the postage system of this country was essentially defective and needed reform. Even the officials in Congress and the general post-office, had become convinced by the success of the ex-

processes and the independent mails, that the old system could not be carried on much longer, and that at least a considerable reduction of the rate of letter postage had become indispensable. All the devices of governmental oppression had been resorted to, with as much pertinacity as if ours were an arbitrary and not a popular government, to maintain the postage monopoly in the hands of the general post-office, and to prevent the people from getting their letters carried by private enterprise at the rate which free competition would show it to be worth. But power was baffled, and at length it became plain to all that concession must come. This concession, however, of cheaper postage, was made with the worst possible grace, and with every possible shift and contrivance to diminish its value to the people, and to secure, if possible, the ill success of the reform.

The new bill was first introduced into the Senate, by the chairman of the committee on the post-office, Mr. Merrick, of Maryland, and was avowedly aimed chiefly to crush the private mails—the relief of the people being entirely a secondary matter. There was one senator alone, who seemed to enter into the true spirit of the reform—Mr. Simmons, of Rhode Island, unfortunately no longer a public man. Mr. Niles, of Connecticut, was strongly in favor of it, and by his experience as a former Postmaster General, was enabled to render essential service in effecting some valuable changes in the transportation of the mails; but the state of his health disabled him from taking the lead. After much debate, in which the chief display was of the little pains our legislators take to make themselves acquainted with facts and principles on a new subject, the bill was carried in the Senate, establishing a uniform rate of letter postage, at five cents per half ounce, irrespective of distance.

When the bill came to the other house, it was so violently opposed, that there was at one time hardly a hope of its being passed at all. One of the chief objections to it, was that it would break up nearly every stage route at the South, because stage-coaches there are only kept up by the exorbitant sums they receive for carrying small mails that might better be carried on horseback. At length, however, it was literally forced through the house, chiefly by the bold and determined spirit of George Rathbun, of New York; but not until a tool named M'Dowell, of Ohio, had adroitly slipped in an amendment, imposing double postage on all letters carried over three hundred miles. This bill, thus damaged, reduced the average rate of postage from fifteen cents to seven and a half, and established the capital principle of charging postage by weight, and not by the number of pieces of paper a letter may comprise. This was, indeed, a great step towards simplification; although the bill contained many provisions that were vexatious and troublesome both to the people and to the department. All the complication of machinery was preserved, with additions involving both expense and perplexity. Probably few acts have ever been passed by Congress, including so many incongruities and absurdities. Still it was a relief.

But, as if to defeat if possible the hopes of the people, the new administration, then just coming in, consigned the management of the post-office to one of the most pertinacious opponents of the reduction,—a man who had spared no pains to defeat it, and who had boldly predicted its failure. And in his first report to Congress, after a trial of only one quarter of a year, he did his best to restore several of the worst features of the old system, under the pretext that the new system had already failed. Fortunately

ly, the condition of Congress renders it almost as difficult to repeal a good law, as it was to pass it; and hence our reduced postage has remained untouched, although it must be admitted that all the legislation since has been to increase the burden of postage. At length, however, the increase of correspondence has been such, by the end of the second year, as almost to restore the former income of the department from letter postage, and we are surprised that the Postmaster General himself is not already a convert to cheap postage, and desirous of securing to his administration the glory of a still farther reduction.

But do as he may, it is evident that cheap postage has stood the test in this country, so far, under the awkward experiment made, as to remove all apprehension of a return to the old and barbarous system. And there are many indications of a desire among the people for further improvement. Under these circumstances, it is quite important to elucidate the principles on which such a reform should be based, to learn the rules by which it should be governed. And here we have a mine of research opened to us in the investigations which preceded and the results which have followed the British system of postage. We know that an impression has been taken up, that Rowland Hill's, or the British system, is not adapted to this country. But we shall show on an examination of the principles and results of that system, that it is even more appropriate to the circumstances of our own country than of Great Britain, and that its adoption here could not fail of producing still more wonderful results.\*

The impression that the British

system is not adapted to our use, has been taken up without a due examination of the subject. There are very few persons who are aware of the high scientific character of that system. It is founded on principles which were deduced by as patient study and as scientific induction as the use of steam or the magnetic telegraph. As a mere study, this system of postage may challenge attention. As a means for the advancement of trade, of science, of morals, of civilization, of freedom, of social happiness in every condition of life, it may justly be regarded as one of the great wonders and great glories of the age.

A single circumstance will show the cogency of the proofs by which the new system must have been sustained. The British government lies under a debt of more than eight hundred millions of pounds sterling, and is constantly put to shifts to attain a sufficient revenue to keep down the interest. In the year 1837, the net revenue derived from postage was £1,646,554; and in 1838 it was £1,656,993. The first year of the new system, it was only £447,664; a loss to the government of £1,209,329. Arguments of great power must have been presented, before the Government would abandon a million and a quarter of revenue for the advancement of an object hitherto so little thought of as cheap postage.

Mr. Rowland Hill, a gentleman destitute of all the advantages of social position, literary fame, or official station, proposed his system to the public in an unpretending pamphlet, in the year 1837. At that time he says he had never been within the walls of the post-office. The scheme rested solely on its merits. Without any of the aids which,

\* Although many of the facts relating to the British post-office system, now given, may be found in our first article, yet the repetition of them seems to be demanded by the present state of the post-

office question in this country. Presented by a new writer, at a time of intense public interest on the subject, it is to be hoped they will command more attention, and produce the desired effect.

in that country particularly, are supposed to be necessary to make a thing "go," his proofs and arguments excited so much attention that before the end of 1838, a Parliamentary Committee was raised to give the proposition a thorough examination. The fruits of that examination fill three folio volumes of Parliamentary Documents, made up of official statements, elaborate calculations, and the recorded testimony of a great number of witnesses. So complete was the proof in favor of the new scheme, that it was adopted by the administration then in power, carried through Parliament, and the necessary preparations made for the new system to go into operation at the beginning of 1840. So great a change of governmental policy, effected by means so inadequate, and in the face of difficulties so formidable, can hardly be found in the annals of deliberative legislation.

Mr. Hill's attention was originally drawn to the defects of the old system of postage, by the remarkable fact that for twenty years, commencing with 1815, there had been no increase of revenue from the post-office. It was deemed an important branch of the revenue; it might reasonably be expected to increase with the growth of the country in population, trade, wealth, intelligence, and general prosperity. But instead of this, the revenue had remained stationary. It was £1,557,291 in 1815; and it was but £1,540,300 in 1835. Mr. Hill constructed the following table, comparing the growth of population with the post-office revenue, showing what the latter would have been had it kept pace with the former, and how much was lost by its failure so to do.

Year	Population.	Net postage rev.	due rev. by population	Loss.
1815	19,562,000	£1,557,291	£1,557,291	
1820	20,928,000	1,479,547	1,677,000	£194,553
1825	22,352,000	1,670,219	1,789,000	118,781
1830	23,961,000	1,517,952	1,917,000	399,048
1835	25,606,000	1,540,300	2,048,000	507,700

This is without making any allowance for the increasing intelligence and prosperity of the people, and shows that the revenue fell short £507,700 of what it ought to have become by the mere increase of population. As a measure of the general prosperity, he then takes the tax on stage-coaches, and shows by its continued increase, what ought to have been the increase of postage, on the assumption, which is fully borne out by other facts, that the demand for the conveyance of letters would naturally increase at least equally with the demand for the conveyance of persons.

Yr.	Net duty on stage-coaches.	Net postage rev.	Due revenue in proportion	Loss.
1815	£317,671	£1,557,291	£1,557,291	
1820	273,477	1,479,547	1,946,000	£166,463
1825	362,631	1,670,219	2,585,000	914,781
1830	418,598	1,517,952	2,990,000	1,472,048
1835	496,497	1,540,300	3,560,000	2,009,700

Thus, while the net revenue from the stage-coaches had increased 128 per cent. in 20 years, the postage revenue, which ought naturally to keep pace with it, had not increased at all. Hence the inference that the post-office lost two millions per annum, by its defective system as a source of revenue—that is, from its excessive rates of taxation, operating as a prohibition of correspondence, or driving that correspondence into private or illicit channels.

Mr. Hill expressed his belief that a reduction of the postage 40 or 50 per cent. would more than keep up the revenue to its actual height. He also stated as his opinion that "there is a reduced rate of postage which would give the greater revenue named above," that is, three and a half millions—not that the revenue would rise at once on the reduction of the postage, but after some time it would advance to that amount. And he refers to many well known cases, where reduced duties have produced an increase of revenue. But it will be seen that eventually, this consideration of in-

creasing the revenue of the post-office, as a primary element to be regarded, was laid entirely out of view, and the adoption of the plan, as well as its details, were settled entirely on other considerations than that of an increase of revenue, or even of keeping it up to its actual rate. This point is deserving of special notice, as a key to the whole of the subsequent developments.

In pursuing investigations on the subject, a practical difficulty was disclosed, which, if other considerations had not prevailed, must interfere very seriously with any plans for the increase of the postage revenue. It is this—that the same multiplication of conveyances and facilities for travel, railroads, steam-boats, &c., which would create an increase of correspondence, increases in a still greater degree the opportunities for evading any thing like a revenue postage, by the facilities both of practicing and concealing the transmission of letters by other channels than the mail.

The penalty for carrying letters otherwise than by mail was five pounds. And yet it was demonstrated to the Committee, that the contraband conveyance of letters in many parts of the kingdom was six, ten, and even twenty fold greater than the mail conveyance. Mr. Hill says, in his evidence, that “owing to the increase of population in the last twenty years, and to the increase of trade, and the general prosperity of the country, and still more perhaps to the extension of education, the number of letters annually written must have increased very greatly; but the number of letters passed through the post-office has not increased at all.” He informed the committee that “it is a notorious fact, that all classes of society, from the highest to the lowest, excepting those only who are exempted from postage by parliamentary or official privilege, frequently send letters otherwise than through

the post-office; there is hardly a carriage of any kind which runs along any of the roads, that does not carry a great many; every parcel almost has letters inclosed; steam-boats carry them; the carriers who go from one town to another, take enormous numbers of letters; indeed, *to evade postage, every possible expedient is resorted to.*”

The evidence accumulated by the committee in support and illustration of these positions is overwhelming, and brought all classes of statesmen to the full conviction that even the British government, with its compact population, its parliamentary omnipotence, its omnipresent police, was utterly unable to suppress or control the contraband letter-carriage. The facilities were so enormous, the act itself so easy and natural, so easily concealed, and so impossible to be detected, except by a scrutiny which the government could not afford to maintain, and which the people never would submit to, that it was idle to attempt coercing the subjection of the correspondence of the country to the control of the post-office. The evil would necessarily increase as correspondence increased, and as the utter impotence of the government in the matter became more palpable to all men. All these conclusions are fully applicable to the United States. There is no remedy but in a radical change of system, which we fortunately have, tried to our hand.

The moral and commercial evils of a high rate of postage are admirably summed up in the following resolution of the Parliamentary Committee. There can be no question that all the same evils exist to an extent nearly equal, in this country, from the same cause. It was to remove these evils that the government of Great Britain, in its parental care for the welfare of its subjects, adopted the system of uniform and cheap postage, and mag-

manimously determined no longer to raise a paltry revenue by means involving so great an injury to the happiness of the people. Many of these interests, it must be admitted, in their ordinary aspects come more properly under the cognizance and care of the state governments. But it is respectfully submitted that so far as they are to be effected by the rates of postage, the federal government alone is capable of affording the desired relief. Especially therefore does it become Congress so to legislate in its exclusive province, as not to inflict or perpetuate the injuries now experienced from the existing system of postage. It is also respectfully represented, that the high rate of postage is now defended solely on the ground of its being necessary to enable the government to extend certain benefits to certain portions of the community, at the expense of the letter correspondence of the mass of citizens. Surely if Congress has the right to extend these benefits, to make these largesses in the way of franking privileges, newspaper circulation, and unproductive mails, it has both the power and the right to pay the expense of its liberality out of the public treasury; and therefore the right to take off its heavy hand from the letter correspondence now so much oppressed. The second resolution of the Parliamentary Committee is as follows:

*"Moral and Commercial Evils of the present high rates of Postage."*—That it is the opinion of this Committee, that the evidence taken before them abundantly proves that the present high rates of postage are extremely injurious to all classes, both in their individual and social capacity, interfering as they do with their progress in moral and intellectual improvement, and, in some degree, with their physical welfare:

"Also, that these rates, by restricting the transmission of letters of advice, invoices, orders, &c., produce a most serious injury to commerce, and consequently to national prosperity:

"That, by checking communication between persons interested in the same ob-

ject, or engaged in the same pursuit, they tend greatly to retard the progress of the nation in art and science:

"That by circumscribing the operations of the different societies instituted for the spread of religion, the advancement of morality, and the promotion of charitable objects, they have an injurious effect on the character of the poorer classes, and also interfere with their domestic comforts:

"That independently of their more direct effect on the progress and dissemination of knowledge, they tend also, by the obstacles they oppose to the writing and publication of books, to limit and deteriorate education:

"That they operate to the prejudice of health, by preventing the transmission of medical advice, and of lymph for vaccination:

"That by occasioning increased expense or delay submitted to for the sake of avoiding expense, they interfere to a serious extent with legal professional correspondence:

"That they either act as a grievous tax on the poor, causing them to sacrifice their little earnings to the pleasure or advantage of corresponding with their distant friends, or compel them to forego such intercourse altogether; thus subtracting from the small amount of their enjoyments, and obstructing the growth and maintenance of their best affections:

"Lastly—that they lead to the most extensive violations or evasions of the statutes for the protection of the post-office revenue, and thus impair that habitual respect for the law, which it should be one of the first aims of an enlightened legislature to secure."

In this country prior to the late partial and inadequate reform, letters were taxed at nearly *the same rate* that formerly prevailed in England, by a scale constructed on the same principles, and the tax upon letters had the same deadening effect upon business and social happiness that was complained of in that country. There was not one evil exposed there, which has not its counterpart here. On this point, Dr. Lardner told the committee in his evidence—

"It is obvious that a cheap postage would produce a great effect on commerce and civilization. In fact, I look upon the post-office revenue to be a most iniquitous tax upon the affections, the morals, upon every social good, and upon every thing that is desirable among a people in a state

of progressive civilization. It is a tax on knowledge, a tax on science, and a tax on literature. I think that the post-office should be used merely as the instrument of intercommunication. I look upon a tax upon correspondence to be the same as a tax would be upon speech. If you made a person pay for every word he uttered, and for every word he heard, it would be exactly the same species of impost; correspondence by letter is only another way of speaking and hearing."

To the question proposed by one of the committee, "Is a tax on bread or a tax on letters the most oppressive on the people?" he replied:—

"I think a tax on bread is the worst; but postage is a tax on the bread of the mind." It is not a tax he says, on the poorer classes of society solely, "because the poorer classes will not pay it; they will not correspond, or rather, they can not correspond, and therefore you extinguish their affections and gain nothing."

Lord Ashburton said in his evidence—

"I have always thought it a very bad means of raising the revenue; I think it is one of the worst of our taxes. We have unfortunately many taxes which have an injurious tendency; but I think few, if any, have so injurious a tendency as the tax upon the communication by letters. I can not doubt that a tax upon communication by letter must bear hardly upon commerce; it is, in fact, taxing the conversation of the people who live at a distance from each other. You might as well tax words spoken upon the Royal Exchange."

But all such speculations are put at rest, in this country, by a single fact now obvious, that **THE BUSINESS OF THE COUNTRY WILL NOT PAY THE TAX**. They believe it to be both unjust and unwise, and injurious to the general welfare as well as their own interests; they have found out how easy it is, and how many ways there are to evade postage. The general opinion that postage is oppressive and that the administration of the department is overbearing and tyrannical, has withdrawn from it the protection of the moral sense of the community; there is no longer a disrepute in sending letters out of the mail, but on the contrary, men make a merit of it, and call it patri-

otic to use every expedient to avoid contributing to the support of the post-office. And the current, which is thus set, can not be turned back by coercive penalties; nor the department restored to public favor, except by a very great reduction. *The department can not be made to support itself.* It must be supported by the treasury, if it remains as at present; it would be no more than that, if the postage were reduced to the wishes of the people. But in the latter case, the highest duty of a republican government would have been discharged by the richest boon bestowed upon the people—equivalent, practically, to **THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE FOR EVERY MAN, WOMAN AND CHILD**. To carry the post-office through, on the present system, will make it a perpetual charge upon the treasury, growing more and more burdensome in proportion as the facilities of intercourse increase among the people. To reduce the postage to the lowest point is the sure way to lay the foundation for a lasting growth, which would be sure, at no distant day, of relieving the treasury even from the expense of extending the mails among the new settlers of the frontiers.

Even if the post-office could be made to support itself, the constitution, which empowers Congress to establish post-offices and post-roads, has made this government justly responsible for the wise and efficient management of that great trust, in such a manner as to answer the ends of its institution, in the universal diffusion of information over the whole country, by the mails. If that can be done, well and wisely, without a charge upon the treasury, let it be done so; but do not let Congress, which spends millions and tens of millions upon the land office, the fortifications, light-houses, &c. &c., allow the post-office to languish or its benefits to be rendered partial, barely because doing its duty will bring a charge on the treasury.

The people must have mails, as long as Congress has a dollar at its disposal from any quarter to pay the expense.

The constitution has enjoined it upon the federal government to see to it that these advantages are secured to the people. It has not limited the resources of Congress for this object to the income derived from postage. If it is made apparent that the revenue from that source is not and can not be made sufficient to meet the reasonable wants of the people in this respect, Congress is not thereby exonerated from its trust. The people must have mails, notwithstanding; and the means must be drawn from the general treasury.

In respect to *the true measure of the rate of postage*, the parliamentary committee spent much labor, and their conclusions have the clearness and certainty of mathematics. The tables and calculations bearing on this point, fill sixteen pages of the appendix to the report. They found that the letters chargeable with postage made up only one-fifth of the weight of the mails—the remainder being composed of newspapers and franked letters or documents. In point of numbers, the chargeable letters made three-fifths of the whole. The letters therefore should be charged one-fifth of the transportation, and three-fifths of the cost of receiving, mailing, sorting and delivering. The whole cost of the post-office was found to be divisible thus—two-fifths for transportation, two-fifths for management, and one-fifth for miscellaneous charges. The actual cost of the letters is then expressed by the formula— $\frac{1}{5}$  of  $\frac{1}{2}$  +  $\frac{3}{5}$  of  $\frac{1}{2}$  =  $\frac{1}{5}$  = 32 per cent. The remaining 68 per cent. of the expense of the post-office, they found was a tax imposed upon the letters, to pay for the free distribution of the newspapers and franked letters and documents. To this was added, in England, an additional tax of 236 per cent. for revenue to the

government. Of the whole sum paid for postage, the actual cost of the letters was only 9½ per cent., and the tax was nine-fold the actual cost. This showed the injustice and the impolicy of taxing the correspondence of the country 900 per cent. on its cost. This tax, in England, served a threefold purpose, viz. paying the expense of the newspapers, paying for the franks, and affording a revenue to the government. In this country, our letters are taxed in like manner for a three-fold purpose, viz. to enable the government to frank, to enable the government to convey newspapers and periodicals under the actual cost, and to enable the government to do its constitutional duty in furnishing the advantages of the mail to the thinly settled parts of the country and the new states. There is no difference in principle, whether the letters are taxed to enable the government to defray its general expenses, or whether the avails of this tax are kept in a separate treasury, and appropriated to a specific object of governmental expenditure, called for by the general good.

Another series of calculations showed that the actual cost of transit of a letter from London to Edinburgh was only one-ninth of a farthing, and that this was also the average cost, per letter, of all the letter mails in the United Kingdom. It is easily seen that where this is the average cost of the whole, it is impossible to vary the rates according to distance, by any scale that would be of any practicable utility. And if we take any particular route, we shall find that the actual cost per letter varies not directly according to the distance, but inversely as the number of letters. For instance, if in a given route, of one hundred miles, the cost of carrying the mail is one dollar per mile, then the cost per letter for the distance would be ten dollars each, if no more than ten letters were carried; would be

one dollar each, if one hundred were carried; would be ten cents each, if one thousand were carried; and would be one cent each if ten thousand were carried. Should any one imagine that the additional weight would involve increased expense, let him consider that the entire weight of ten thousand letters, at the average of a quarter of an ounce, would be only one hundred and fifty-six pounds and a quarter; that one-half of the actual cost expended in the posting of letters, is for the office service—that is, for receiving, mailing and distributing; which is the same whatever be the distance. It follows that if any difference should be made in the postage of letters, to be exactly just to all parties it should vary not according to distance, but inversely according to the number of letters, rising in price on those routes which have the fewest letters. But this is manifestly impracticable. Therefore the question of distance is to be laid entirely out of view, in determining what is the just rate of postage, and we see that a uniform rate is the nearest to exact justice of any rule that can be devised.

This subject of distances is the great sticking point in American minds, in applying the results of the British system to our own country; we therefore present it in another point of view. Suppose the government first to establish a mail between two of the cities, say Boston and New York, such a mail being required by the wants of the people of those two towns, without reference to any places beyond. For the same reason, you afterwards establish a mail between New York and Philadelphia, solely to accommodate the correspondence between those two places. Then you find that Boston and Philadelphia also have occasion for correspondence with each other. It is easy to see that it would cost no more to carry the mails than it did before, because

the weight of the *letters* is of no moment. In like manner, you may extend mails from point to point to any extent, provided each separate route is itself a productive one; that is, if the route furnishes letters enough to support itself. In this way it is proved that it makes no assignable difference in the expense to the department, whether a letter is carried from Boston to New York, or from Boston to New Orleans.

This illustration will help us to get hold of the distinction between carrying the mail and carrying individual letters in the mail. The government establishes a mail over a certain route, and this mail is to pass at regular intervals, whether the number of letters be great or small. In this "great country," where we have so many "magnificent distances," it necessarily follows that if the inhabitants generally are to have mail accommodations, it must be at the expense of the government. In a country so closely settled as England, perhaps there are few or no routes which do not pay their own expenses; while here, the number of unproductive routes must be very great. We wish some member of Congress would move a call upon the department for a return of all the unproductive routes. To us it appears clear that the expense of these unproductive routes ought to be paid out of the treasury, as justly as the expense of building a light-house or deepening a harbor. Then there would be no objection or difficulty in the way of applying all the reasoning and all the results of the British system to our own case.

We have said nothing in reference to the fact that while the strongest opposition to cheap postage comes from the South, it is the North that pays the chief part of the postage, and it is in the South that we find the greatest number of unproductive routes, and the chief difficulty in making the post-office pay

its expenses. We do not wish this movement to be entangled with any hostile considerations whatever. And as to the maintenance of such routes at the South, we but speak the general sentiment of the North in declaring, that we are ready to go to the utmost bounds of reasonable requirement in maintaining as many mail routes in the South as the people desire—only let the money be taken from the common stock of the general treasury, because the threading of the South with mail routes is a great national interest, having no necessary connection with our enjoyment of cheap postage. If nothing less will satisfy the South, let the bill contain a pledge that the extent of mails in any State shall not be diminished from the present ratio, but shall be increased at least equal to the increase of population.

The immense social and moral benefits to be expected from cheap postage—the benefits already experienced in another country—the security given to the rights of the people, to the public peace, to liberty, and to the Union, are subjects reserved for another article, unless Congress should for once make so much haste to do right, as to leave us no opportunity of further argument.

We should like to show in some detail, the advantages of a strictly uniform rate of postage, from the great simplicity which it would give to the keeping of accounts. It would save the services of at least one half of the clerks in the accounting bureau at Washington. It would save one or more clerks in the post-office of every large town. It would render the keeping of a country post-office so easy and simple, that it might be done by some plain mechanic or some dealer in small wares, who could be well paid for the trouble with a far less sum than country postmasters now receive. It would close the door against innumerable frauds. By introducing

small stamps for postage, and having all letters pre-paid, the mails would be relieved of a large share of the dead letters now so burdensome.

The scale of postage in England is one penny sterling for every half ounce. This is the only rule they have. Pamphlets, if sent by mail, pay at that rate. Newspapers are printed on stamped paper, the government receiving one penny for each stamp, and then the newspapers go postage free. They may be mailed and remailed a dozen times, if you choose, but they are never charged with any postage. Newspapers printed on *unstamped* paper pay the same as letters, 1d. per half ounce. Nothing can be more simple. All postages must be pre-paid or they are charged double. By this simple principle they secure the pre-payment of about ninety-seven hundredths of all the postage. That is the British system.

We believe the only question in regard to our adoption of the British system, so far as letters are concerned, is on the rate, whether it shall be two cents per half ounce, which is very nearly the same with the British, or whether it should go still lower, and approach still nearer to a universal power of franking, by making the postage only one cent per half ounce.

With regard to newspapers, our plan would be this.

1. That all newspapers sent to regular subscribers should be charged one cent postage, payable quarterly in advance, and none should continue to be sent unless so paid.

2. That all transient newspapers should be charged as single letters—two cents postage if pre-paid, and doubled if sent unpaid.

Our representatives in the 30th Congress will do a greater service to their country by introducing this system, than by any thing else they can possibly attempt, except by the termination of the war with Mexico.

## BUSHNELL ON CHRISTIAN NURTURE.\*

IN our last number we gave a hasty notice of the "New Theological Controversy," which had originated in the publication of Dr. Bushnell's two "Discourses on Christian Nurture," and which then seemed likely to continue.

Since that time, there has been but little progress in the discussion, and as far as publications are concerned, the *status belli* is very nearly as we left it. The Committee of the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society have not seen fit to take any public notice of the "Argument" addressed to them. Meanwhile the author has assumed to himself the copyright which he never wholly relinquished, and has issued in a volume, "the Discourses," the "Argument," and other productions that are related to the subject in discussion. These are, an article on the "Spiritual Economy of Revivals," first published in the Christian Spectator for 1838; another entitled "Growth not Conquest the true method of Christian Progress," which originally appeared in the New Englander for 1844, under another title; and two sermons, now published for the first time, one entitled "the Organic unity of the family," and the other, "the scene of the Pentecost and a Christian Parish." The design of this additional matter, was to explain, to vindicate, and to qualify the positions advanced in the Discourses and the Argument. The volume is substantially one, having one object and being sustained by the same considerations; all of which are suggested or implied in the original discourses. The discourses give us the substance of the entire volume. The additional essays, &c., are but an ex-

pansion and defense of its principles and arguments.

We do not propose to give an extended account of this volume. Nor do we think it necessary for the purpose which we have in view in this discussion. That it shows on every page the attractions peculiar to its author, we need not say. Our constant readers are too familiar with these attractions to require that they should be commented upon by us. These readers also know that Dr. Bushnell, as one associated in the conduct of this journal, is a writer and a man whose aid we value most highly, and on whom we very much rely. We are very willing, too, to have them suppose, that we should be inclined to bestow a friendly and perhaps a partial criticism upon any of his productions. We should be quite ashamed to be supposed capable of any other feelings. At the same time, we are not willing to confess ourselves conscious of any deficiency in the purpose to judge of his positions and arguments in any other than the light of truth, or to withhold from them a full and unbiased scrutiny. Without premising any farther, we enter at once into the critical examination which we have proposed, following our own order of thought.

We inquire at the outset—What is the truth that is advanced and defended by the author? To this inquiry, he has given a distinct answer. The doctrine of the original discourses is thus announced in his own language. "Assuming then the question above stated, What is the true idea of Christian education? I answer in the following proposition, which it will be the aim of my arguments to establish, viz: THAT THE CHILD IS TO GROW UP A CHRISTIAN. In other words, the aim, effort and expectation should be, not, as is commonly assumed, that the

\* Views of Christian Nurture, and of subjects adjacent thereto; by Horace Bushnell. 12mo, pp. 247. Hartford: Edwin Hunt. 1847.

child is to grow up in sin, to be converted, after he comes to a mature age; but that he is to open on the world as one that is spiritually renewed, not remembering the time when he went through a technical experience, but seeming rather to have loved what is good from his earliest years."—p. 6.

The proposition announced in these words seems to us to be sufficiently clear and intelligible. It speaks its meaning for itself. To avoid any possible debate or confusion, we add that it is in form a practical proposition, or a proposition concerning a duty. The duty is that Christian parents and teachers should aim, strive and expect, to realize a given result. That result is, "that the child is to grow up a Christian." The reality and the obligation of the duty, will of course turn upon a question of fact. That question is, whether the result contemplated is both possible and attainable. This is the only question about which there is or can be any difference of opinion, and the whole discussion is entirely concerned with this question of truth or of fact. No man will deny or question, if the implied truth thus contended for by Dr. Bushnell is established, that the consequent duty will follow. The proposition actually discussed is one of fact. The author contends that a child can and may be expected to grow up a Christian. The great question about which he concerns himself, is the question of the truth or falsehood of this position.

We inquire next, whether there is any thing *new* or peculiar in this position which Dr. B. takes and defends? We raise this inquiry, because the author contends that it is *peculiar*, in distinction from that which he supposes his readers to hold—and in distinction also from the view current among the churches; and that therefore it will be considered by them as *new*, though inasmuch as it has been recognized in

other countries and at other times, it is not *new*. We raise it also for another reason. There is a certain class of critics, whose wisdom is often exhausted by the very pitiful observation on a doctrine, which they are unable or are indisposed to canvass, that "whatever is new in it is not true, and whatever is true is not new." For this common decision of cautious and non-committal wisdom, we have very little respect, albeit it constitutes the entire stock of many who are cried up as oracles for safety and profoundness. It is with an eye to them that we propose the question, whether there is any thing *peculiar* and *new* in the position of the author.

The author, as we have said, thinks his views are new and peculiar. "But unhappily the public mind is preoccupied extensively by a view of the whole subject, which I must regard as a theoretical mistake, and one which must involve, as long as it continues, practical results systematically injurious. This mistaken view it is necessary, if possible, to remove. And accordingly what I have to say will take the form of an argument on the question thus put in issue."—pp. 5, 6. What the mistaken view is, with which he joins issue, he indicates in his formal proposition, as already quoted. He does it in the words, "not as is commonly supposed that the child is to grow up in sin, to be converted after he comes to a mature age." With the view thus stated he holds a vigorous argument. He expands this view. He dwells upon it. He attempts to show its absurdity and inconsistency with the nature of things, with other received principles, with the methods of God in nature and in grace, with his declarations in his word and with the experience of other nations and other times. The fact that the view against which he contends is really held, he does not discuss. This he takes for granted. Is he right in

this assumption? Is the opinion against which he contends the prevailing opinion, and is his own opinion peculiar in being different from that which generally prevails?

In undertaking to answer this question, we can only speak of that which is more generally received, and which is recognized as the current doctrine. For a doctrine may be current, and yet not be universally received. The writer of these remarks has always believed and preached the doctrine advanced by Dr. Bushnell. He has even preached it in the same antagonistic form which he has adopted, as being different from the theoretical views of the great mass of the Christian community, and from the practical aims of the most of his hearers. It is to be supposed that not a few have held and taught, and sought to act upon the same opinion. Many too may have felt dissatisfied with the current doctrine, and have felt and strongly felt that there must be a truth that differed from that doctrine, and yet have not reached any settled conclusions. All this is quite consistent with the fact that the view of these discourses differs from that which is generally received.

What then is the generally received opinion in respect to Christian nurture? It is generally held, we believe, that there is a nurture which is peculiarly Christian—that there are methods of discipline and instruction which are the appointed means of spiritual blessings, and that to fulfill the measure of duty which rests upon the Christian parent, is a most serious obligation. We do not believe that there exists a Christian parent in New England, who does not suppose that he owes important duties of this kind to his children, and that the training which they shall receive from him has much to do with the question, whether they shall be Christians at all, and also with the question, what sort of Christians they shall be. We

believe it is also true, that the majority of New England Christians view this training as a process preparatory to the possession of the Christian character by their children,—and that as a preparatory discipline, ‘a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ’ it is generally to be long continued, and patiently prosecuted for years, before the result shall be realized—that the main design of so slow and gradual a development of the powers of the infant into childhood and youth, is to provide for a long course of this discipline, which may be expected to result in conversion, when the child attains that reflection which shall fit it to understand and receive the Gospel. This it is thought must be the ordinary history of the Christian life. Exceptions are admitted to be possible by all. It is allowed that now and then, there may grow up the rare and blessed spectacle of a child that shall have never known the time when prayer and praise were not exhaled from its spirit, as naturally and as constantly as the sweet breath of the morning rises from the dewy bosom of the earth—a child into the history of whose intellectual and moral life, kind affections and virtuous resolutions, conscientious services and religious hope, have been so closely intertwined, as to seem a part of that life itself. But these children are spoken of as special and strange exceptions to the ordinary method of God—as sanctified of God by a special act of his favor;—children around whose cradle bright angels of grace have watched, and into whose infantile dreams they have breathed gentler and purer influences than fall to the lot of ordinary mortals. The blessing of such a child is looked upon as peculiar, to hope for which would be presumptuous by ordinary mortals, and to attempt to train which would be to commit an audacious effrontery, by asserting a claim sure to be dis-

honored, upon the secret and reserved gifts of God's sovereign pleasure. Accordingly such children are looked for in the hut of some widowed mother in Israel, as the rare comfort in sorrow patiently and meekly endured, the only flower left to cheer her along her desolate pathway—or perhaps in the house of some patient and noble laborer for Christ, the earnest of the reward for which he hopes—or perhaps in the line of a long series of eminent Christians, as the memorial of prayers that in past generations went up to God—or, which is last and rarest of all, as sent into some house of godlessness and sin, a child of innocence in the midst of corruption, to carry the remembrance, the reproofs and the attractions of heaven, into the very precincts and among the very defilements of hell.

We do not say that the existence of such a character is deemed a miracle, for it would not be true; but we do say, that as far as the hope to rear such a child by efforts appropriate to the result, is concerned, so far it is viewed as though it were a miracle. It is treated as a miracle, so far as not to be labored for, because labor for it is thought to have no propriety. Nay, it is not even prayed for with any faith, because it is a gift of so rare and singular a character, that even to pray for it to be wrought by concealed methods of grace, is thought to be presumptuous.

The grounds for this opinion are manifold. There is first, the view of the Christian scheme as necessarily beyond the reach and comprehension of the mind of the infant. The child, it is reasoned, must be saved by the Gospel. The Gospel to exert its influence on the character, must be understood. In order to be understood, the character of God, the evil of sin in its demerit and danger, the work of Christ as a justifying Savior, must be reflected upon and believed. These are the

fewest truths, and this the simplest scheme of doctrine, that can be thought of, to furnish the basis of faith. But a mind to understand these truths, must be trained to reflection, and must be so far developed as to comprehend them. It is well even, if more than this is not supposed essential to conversion. Too often is it thought necessary that the Gospel should be expanded into an intricate metaphysical statement, and embarrassed by the subtleties of scholastic distinctions, and assent is demanded to all this in order that the Christian character may have a beginning. For this a mature mind is requisite—a mind not only mature enough for the ordinary processes of thought, but one specially disciplined in the niceties of dogmatic theology. But to such a comprehension of Christian truth, the mind of the child is entirely unequal, and on the theory which makes it necessary, it is cut off from the Christian character, simply because it is not sufficiently mature; and no effort, no prayer, and no hope is put forth, till the child shall be old enough to comprehend the Christian scheme. All the efforts that are used have a prospective reference. They all look to a date pushed forward in the history of the child. The prayers even, are all drafts on time upon the treasury of heaven. In order to hasten the time of possible conversion, great pains are taken to simplify the doctrines of Christianity down to the capacity of the child. Metaphysical disquisitions on the nature of the soul, the attributes of God, the evidences of Christianity, and almost on the origin of evil, are amplified and diluted. They are spiced with stories and illustrated by pictures, in order to steal a year or two upon the appointed time for the development of reflection, and to shorten the dreary season of necessary impiety.

Another cause akin to the one just named, is the very prevalent

conviction that the Christian life must begin by regeneration experienced as a conscious change of character. This supposes the capacity for reflection distinctly developed, and the power to scrutinize closely and clearly the inner self, in order to observe and record its internal processes. Now inasmuch as the child is intellectually incapable of such an experience, it is thought in vain to hope for it. The child lives in the outward. Its inner self is unknown as an object of reflection. Its very joys and sorrows, its passions, hopes and fears, are all *projected* upon the outward objects that excite them. It hardly knows that it has a heart, a conscience, affections, or a will, and the teaching that it must have a new heart to begin with, and that it will do no good to begin till it has first aimed to have a new heart and succeeded in this aim, is paralyzing to the parent, and if nothing worse, is Chinese to the child. The parents are aware that such a conversion, as a conscious event to the mind reflecting on itself, is beyond the years and the powers of the infants that prattle on their knees. To alleviate this difficulty, the same effort is used to force the mind to an unnatural precocity, and to drive it into itself by most unnatural and revolting efforts at self-reflection. The child is set to the metaphysical study of the question, 'how to get a new heart,' by a treatise or story that is supposed to dilute this complex subject down to its infant understanding.

Last of all, the prevalent view is confirmed by a reference to the actual history of early conversions. It now and then happens that in a season of excited religious activity, or perhaps stimulated by the warnings and entreaties of faithful parents, one or many children seem to begin the Christian life, and the hope is feebly ventured that they have true Christian feelings. But the season of present excitement is soon

passed. Childhood and youth return to their sports and their thoughtless moods, and because the Christian convert does not show his piety by the gravity of premature manhood—because he does not moralize like a sage of seventy, or look out upon life with the sadness of one who has had experience of life's anguish and its tears, its early promise of goodness is at once set down as a "false conversion," and this severe conclusion is written on the brow of parents and Christian friends. Nay, it is well if it do not stare out from the chambers of the soul, like the handwriting upon the wall, '*no hope*,' '*the evil heart still remains*.'

We ask next whether the view advanced in these discourses is true and justly stated. We quote the words a second time for the sake of clearness. "The aim, effort, and expectation should be—that he [the child] is to open on the world as one that is spiritually renewed, not remembering the time when he went through a technical experience, but seeming rather to have loved what is good from his earliest years." Is the fact taken for granted in this proposition of duty, that a child may and may be expected thus to "open on the world," well grounded? Is, the statement true or false. On this point we feel no hesitation. Of its truth, we doubt not in the least. And yet to guard against any possible misconstruction, we add the following explanations of what we suppose the author to have intended by his language. When he speaks of the child rightly trained as "not remembering the time when he went through a technical experience," we do not suppose him to mean that the child shall know nothing of reflection upon sin indulged or committed, with the honesty of hearty repentance and the relief of trusting faith. Such "experiences" are not unfrequent occurrences in the history of the best of men long after the first "tech-

nical experience" which seemed to introduce them to the Christian life. Nor do we suppose that he means, that there is to be none of that conflict between duty and inclination which constitutes much of the moral discipline of the present life. On the contrary he speaks of "a rough mental struggle" which the child already a Christian, often goes through "at some future day," and which is so like a first conversion as to be supposed to be such a fact. When too, he describes the child as "seeming rather to have loved what is good from his earliest years," he does not mean that this child has never known the love of the evil as striving to get the mastery over the love of the good, or that his love of the good has been an even onward impulse, driving him with the steady impulse of the trade winds on the smooth Pacific. This last can not be intended if the first is not.

The doctrine as thus explained we hold to be true, and contend that the effort of a true Christian nurture should be, so to train a child that he should thus open on the world. We hold it to be true for the following reasons. First, it is not necessary as is commonly believed that Christianity in order to be received should be received as a completed system of truth, adapted to the reflective mind that is fully developed. Right feeling or which is the same thing, holy feeling, is possible and supposable with no knowledge either of God or Christ, of sin against the Creator, or of his readiness to pardon and save. To suppose an infant wakening into a life with no emotions but virtuous emotions, and with a will acting itself out in benevolent affections, is not to suppose that which in its nature is an impossibility, though the supposition may never be realized in fact. To make such a supposition possible, there is no need that the infant should cease to be an infant,—no necessity that in the

place of the infant's knowledge limited to the furniture of the nursery, there should be substituted the wide range of the man who soars beyond the stars in his thoughts of the infinite Creator. There is no need that instead of the infant's unreflecting conviction that it owes obedience to a mother's will, for the sake of that mother's love, there should be introduced the whole theory of God as a lawgiver and a reflecting faith as to the reasons why he ought to rule. Nor is it required that instead of the child's conviction that it is well and right to trust the look that tells him that the mother, whose love has been wronged, still longs to forgive, and under the power of that look, to give way to generous relenting, it must have a clear understanding of the doctrine of justification by faith, and a knowledge of the right theory of the atonement. As soon as there is the knowledge of any moral truth, so soon is there the possibility of a hearty subjection to that truth. As soon as the moral nature of man is at all developed, so soon can that nature be followed, and take to itself the fair proportions prescribed by its own internal laws, and be harmoniously developed. We say clearly and without reserve, that it is possible for a perfect being to exist in the perfect exercise of all its powers, to have nothing but virtuous or holy feelings, wrought but right or holy purposes, days, weeks, nay, months and years, without the knowledge even of God, or the Savior.

Wherever there is sin, there may be holiness; wherever there is wrong feeling, there may be right feeling; wherever there is a wrong character, there may be a right character. It is a very common doctrine that infants are sinners from a very early period. It is a not uncommon doctrine, perhaps, that they are sinners before they sin. But against whom do they sin? do they sin against God. Sin against God, when all the

objects in the universe, whose existence they recognize, may be, a doll, a rattle-box, a hammer, their nurse or their mother! This is impossible. If then they may sin and exercise sinful emotions, or put on a sinful character, without knowing that there is a God, and much more without being reflectingly acquainted with even the simplest elements of religious knowledge, it is true on the other hand that they *may have* holy feelings and put on a holy character, without such knowledge and such reflection.

To present the argument in another form: it is not uncommon to see a child in some exhibition of sin against a parent's love and authority, and to watch the unreasonableness, the perversion, the fixed and passionate willfulness against love and patience and reason in the demand of the parent. Who ever saw such an exhibition, without waiting with earnest anxiety for the favorable instant, when the worse feeling should give place to the better, and reason and love should gain the victory, and who, if he has waited long in vain, did not condemn the infant sinner for failing to feel and do as he ought, and perhaps also condemn the patience of the parent, because it withheld the punishment that was due.

But all this it may be said, pertains to the natural affections, and to the very imperfect morality which regulates their workings, and has no relevancy to the question, whether there can be holiness or true and religious virtue in a mind so infantine. To this we reply that it has the utmost relevancy, for the reason that if in the cases supposed there can be sin in the moral and religious sense, then in the same case there may and ought to be holiness. Nay there *may* be holiness, because there *ought* to be holiness.

We might at this point go on and show positively how there is furnished to such a mind all the ob-

jects requisite for right feeling and action, all the motives that urge it strongly to the right, and all the requisites in itself to make its activity reach to the heart and carry with it the whole man. But this will be brought up by succeeding considerations.

It may here be objected, that for the purposes of testing character, the child's want of acquaintance with religious truth may suffice, but that it can not for the purpose of recovery and repentance—that to act on the mind for this object, religious truth must be formally stated and received with mature reflection, and hence that we can not hope for the recovery of the child until its powers can concern themselves with the mysteries of redemption. The objector would doubtless argue that there is a peculiar power in the love of God to man, as revealed in the life and death of Christ—which can not be brought to act for his recovery, till God as existing and God as revealed in Christ, and Christ as living and dying for the purpose of recovering the sinner, can be comprehended by the soul. We do not lose sight of the power of this truth, compared with any and every other truth which the mind can know. It shines out amidst all the other knowledge to which man attains for his moral renovation, as the sun among the stars. But the question is, is man so hopelessly evil in every case, or in the majority of cases, that he must wait till this truth can be comprehended, before his moral recovery can be secured, and the will be made a captive to saving influences? Certainly not. That which gives the truth its power, is, that here is love for the unworthy, so patient and forbearing, that it will do every thing that it can to recover the sinner, and use every possible method to show the intensity of this desire. Who shall say that this love may not look upon a wayward infant, and into the soul of the infant,

before that infant can understand the language of words, and *so* look into that soul that it shall relax from its guilty purpose, and even relax from the guilty character of which that purpose is but an expression? Who knows that a mother's look upon her child, may not be armed with the same converting power as attended the look which Christ gave to Peter? Who does *not* know that such looks of faithful parents are attended with temporary relentings and resolves, whose only deficiency is that they carry not the whole man. What hinders that these same relentings should be lasting and thorough, and thus be repentings unto life, which need not to be repented of.

The fact should never be forgotten, that the objects of all the good or evil feelings, of which the child is capable, for its first years, are those that the family furnishes. The beginnings of its moral life are shaped and formed upon the living beings by which it is environed in its very earliest years. 'The authority and faithfulness and love, against which it nerves the mysterious and awful energy of its infant will, is the authority and faithfulness of its parent or its nurse. If by these it is awed and subdued and charmed, it is by them as they are displayed in the parent and nurse. The only being whom the infant adores and loves and worships, is the father whom it reverences by its childish instinct. The benefactor whose love warms it into love again, or charms down its obstinate and wicked purpose, is the mother that can never forget her child. It is upon these beings so nearly allied to it, and in whose presence are formed and shaped all the earliest movements of its intellectual and moral being, that it tries the fearful experiment of sin, and as we contend may make the blessed experience of holy love and obedience.

It should also be remembered that

as this infant slowly climbs up to the distinct conception of God and of infinite goodness, or of Christ and of love unto death, it is out of the moral materials furnished from those real beings with whom it comes in contact, that it shapes these awful conceptions which by the act of faith are received as stupendous realities. These creations 'not seen but believed,' are of all the truths which the adult man knows, the grandest and the most commanding. Reason and conscience both acknowledge them to be the appropriate and lawful sovereigns of the soul. As the young immortal looks out from the paternal roof, and gazes up to the higher roof of the heavens above him, that moment God as a higher and holier Father takes precedence of his earthly parent. The instant that he reaches out beyond his earthly relationships, he finds himself caught into those which connect him with the moral administration of God. But it may well be made a question whether these truths of faith, received by the reflecting and adult man, have more power for evil or for good—whether they are more commanding or are so fitted to move, as the realities perceived by the senses and brought home by sensible contact, with which the infant man comes first in collision, and out of which it shapes its conception of these greater realities;—whether for all the purposes of moral impression and of moral recovery, the administration of the family is not more effective, and has not within itself higher capacities for moral and religious influence than any which comes afterwards.

We find as a result in fact, that those unfortunate children who have had but scanty experience of goodness and of wisdom in earthly parents, are very slow to form the conception of goodness and wisdom in God, and still more slow to believe that that they really exist. Whereas let a child have seen little else than

wisdom and goodness in a parent's administration, he can never have the faith in their reality, or in their difference from the opposite, driven out of him. So much has *faith* in God to do with *faith* in parental virtue as taught by experience.

We find on the other hand, another class of children who are esteemed most fortunate in their religious advantages, but who seem to us to be well nigh as unhappy as those whose early homes are houses of sin. The parents are amiable, exemplary and religious. They devote themselves through attentive days and sleepless nights to the welfare of their children. They guard them with excessive care from contact with vulgarity, impurity and vice. They load them with counsels, concerning their duty to God who has made them, and the Savior who has died to redeem them. They lead them to the throne of grace. They inculcate the most rigid punctiliousness in repeating prayers and hymns. And they look for delightful results in the early piety of their children, and in the beautiful development of a perfect Christian character. And yet they are appalled and almost heart-broken, when they see the reverse of all this. The child loathes the religious counsels with which he has been drugged from his earliest infancy. They call forth no warm and affectionate response in his subdued and warm returns of love. The child is without moral sense, and rushes to every evil work as by the unbridled impulse of brute nature. What is the cause of this sad disappointment? Why are these instrumentalities of no effect? So far as parental training is at fault, it is usually and almost universally at fault in this, that the religious instruction is not in harmony with the parental administration, but is hostile to it. The parental government, which should be the lively symbol of the government of God, is a likeness of any thing

rather than of this. The one touches the child at every moment, envelops him by a perpetual presence, gives him impressions when he is in a most plastic state, becomes interwoven into all his earliest associations and prejudices, and furnishes the materials out of which he conceives of spiritual realities. The other government is described by words, and brought down to the infant understanding by illustrations. But these words are all taken from things that pertain to the lower government—the illustrations are drawn from these relations. If this administration is weak, indulgent, capricious, luxurious, deficient in true moral earnestness and manifest sincerity—if in a word it does not represent truly and heartily the administration of God, all the religious admonition and prayer and expostulation may not only be lost, but is worse than lost. It may be worse than lost, because the power that there is in its awful words and awful thoughts, may be expended only to deaden sensibility, and to excite disgust and contempt. Hence there is many a child who may with truth be said to be most unfortunate, just in proportion to the amount of education called religious which he has received. No one is so hardened as he, so hopelessly irreclaimable, so reprobate to all good, so desperate in respect to recovery.

These considerations are sufficient we think to establish the fact that, in order that a nurture appropriately Christian should begin or even take effect, it is *not* necessary that the mind be mature enough to receive Christianity as a system of truth.

Nor is it requisite, we observe in the second place, that the Christian life should begin as a conscious change of character, and that on this account its beginning should be delayed till after the mind is mature enough to understand and strive after such a change. The doctrine of conversion, and that view of man's

moral constitution and the essence of true virtue which it involves, we hold to be philosophically evident, and to be clearly revealed and sanctioned by the Scriptures. We can conceive of nothing virtuous which does not pertain to the character, the heart, the will, or whatever you call the commanding law of the man. If this be wrong, it ought to be right. If it ought to be right, it ought to be right at once. If it ever is right, it must begin to be so by an instantaneous occurrence. And that such a change should occur in the moral history of a man mature enough to give account of himself, and who has been living with all his energy in a wrong direction, without being noticed by himself in some of its attendant experiences, and without producing a decisive alteration in the course of his thoughts, his feelings, his purposes, his hopes and his joys, would be the most unlikely of all events. But it were quite as unnatural, on the other hand, that a mature and reflecting man even should be able to notice each successive step of the process, and to mark with unerring precision the time upon the clock when this change occurs. It were unnatural we say to expect it, and the results are most unnatural when it is made necessary as a test of the reality of the occurrence. And it becomes especially unnatural, and to a sound mind revolting and fanatical, when it is demanded that the man by inference even, should be able to tell the moment when God by his finger touched his spirit and made it whole. When the additional doctrine is held or the demand is made, that the soul should know the presence of the Spirit by direct consciousness, the material is furnished for the worst excesses and the most disgusting orgies of fanaticism. The working of the doctrine may be arrested by the sound sense or the gentle spirit of many a saintly and pious soul, or by the social influences of

a well ordered religious community. But the unholy fire is laid upon the altar, and soon will it mingle its blue flame and sulphurous smell even with the purest offering, and it will be well if it does not choke it altogether, or profane and defile the altar on which it was kindled.

If then the doctrine of conversion as used or applied, must be applied with these cautions to the reflecting man, how much more to the unreflecting infant. If a man may be converted, and yet not know the time or trace the process, how much more may the child be thus converted. And if the fact that it so occurs, forms no objection in the case of the man, why should the incapacity for it in the case of the child be any objection.

The argument then, that a child can not enter the Christian life, because it is too young to go through the experience of a conscious conversion, must fall to the ground. That this conversion be genuine in the case of the man, it is not required that it be developed to the eye of reflection, in all its separate elements. Why then need it be so developed to the child at all? If a change from holiness to sin in the case of our first parents, might all turn upon the choice or rejection of the forbidden fruit, surely a change from sin to holiness may turn on a single act of love or obedience, that is put forth by a child.

There is no ground of objection from the apparent failure in the instances of early conversion which have been tested by experience and been thought to fail. The tests in the majority of these cases are wholly inappropriate and false. It is not only ignorant but cruel to expect that the Christian child should cease to be a child; and to frown upon the first buddings of its childish piety with suspicious looks, because it does not wear all the forms of reflecting wisdom, or to discourage the first and feeble beginnings of its hopes because

they are mingled with the thoughtlessness, the changeful moods, and the occasional inconsistencies which are natural to merry and careless infancy. If we judged of the character of older Christians by tests as severe, and as unsuitable as those which we apply to children, it may well be questioned whether the tests would not as often disappoint us. Then again, we do not give to these early nurselings the genial Christian culture which we might and ought. Certainly we do not, if we chill them by our suspicions of their sincerity, and force them into premature and hypocritical gravity by the rigor of our requirements. So too, if we withhold from them the constant incitement of our own tempered lives and pure affections and consistent purposes, the appropriate atmosphere which dependent childhood seeks and requires, we should not wonder that an early blight so often serves to blast their delightful promise. Childhood lives in the atmosphere made for it by its elders; if that atmosphere is corrupted, let it be no matter of wonder, that its piety so often seems to die.

To all this it may be said, that this may be a finely sounding theory, but it will not hold true in fact—that though it may be plausibly argued, that there is no reason why children should not thus early begin the Christian life, yet it is not to be expected that they will do so in fact. Certainly they will not in fact, so long as it is believed that they will not; and whether it is believed that they will not or that they can not, makes but little difference, in its influence on the diligence and zeal with which we labor for this end. If it be a received doctrine that the Christian life can not begin, till religious truth is distinctly received, and until the powers are matured for a formal conversion, then no effort will be made for any other result. All the nurture that is bestowed will contemplate a prepa-

ration for a deferred success. But let it be once believed, that there can be a religious nurture, in the very earliest training of infancy, and what earnestness of effort will there be, that the training be made religious.

If it must be a theory only, and not a theory realized in fact, it is because a true religious culture is so often a theory, and so rarely a fact. But let it be supposed that an angel should have the sole care and handling of an infant from the moment of its birth, and that all the earnestness of a seraph's ardent piety, should be able to communicate with the infant through the means of power that are furnished in human sympathies, and by parental affection, can it be thought for a moment, that such a parent would convey no moral and religious impressions, by its looks and ways, and the whole machinery by which the mother knows how to awaken the interest, and to move the sympathies—that even before the language of words were learned, the language of the heart would not be used for this purpose. No man can doubt it for an instant. And there only needs to be the same faith and the same earnestness for the object in the mind of every parent, to induce a revolution in the expectations and aims and results of all the families that truly deserve the name of Christian. But we need not urge the question of fact, whether or not the child will be truly holy before its acquaintance with God and Christ. We may safely and reasonably believe, nay, we may certainly know, that the preparatory influences of the nursery may blend so gracefully and harmoniously with its rudimental religious instruction, and both may act so well together, that as the powers are developed, and the knowledge is enlarged and the habits are matured, there shall be first a Christian infant, then a Christian child and then a Christian man.

We do not suppose it will be objected by any one, that the mind of an infant is beyond the reach of the influences of the Divine Spirit. "Heaven lies about us in our infancy," says the poet, and it may be more than figuratively true. At what period of life, are moral truths realized with so much simplicity, and impressions of them more deep and earnest than in the tender years of an honest and truthful child? When do the great objects of religious faith stand up before the soul with a grandeur so awful and a reality so vivid and unquestioned, as when the curtain is first drawn back from eternity, by the pious parent? These impressions are fleeting, it is true, but while they last, they are most distinct, and the soul responds to them with quick and sensitive emotions. At what period would it be more likely, that the spirit should take of these things and show them to the spirit of man, with distinct and abiding presence, or wake up its emotions into a constant activity, than at this? In infancy there are wondrous processes of thought and reflection, which are shut out from the eye of every observer, and which if they could be exposed or recalled, would solve all the perplexing questions of philosophy. It is then that are twisted the secret and mysterious cords, more magical than those which the 'fatal sisters' were thought to spin. To these hidden processes, this divine spirit has direct access. It can preside over their workings by a bennignant and powerful presence. No thread of their magic cord is so fine as to escape its notice, and at a gracious moment, it can interweave a golden thread which shall bind the spirit to holiness and to God.

A powerful argument for the truth of this view may be drawn from the fact that the system of things under which we live is in its design and structure a redemptive system. It is not a system of moral law, or as the old divines would say, a "cove-

nant of works," under which each human being steps forth with powers matured, and with full knowledge of his duty and exposures, with a clear comprehension of God and his law, and a nature equally inclined to evil as to good—to make under these circumstances, the fearful experiment of obedience or disobedience which shall decide his destiny. Nor does he come into the world with a rudimental nature merely, which is placed here, to be educated into habits of holiness, and then to be transplanted into a fairer and more genial sphere, for the exercise of those powers which have here been trained at school. No; it is for recovering purposes that man is here developed and trained and disciplined as he is. It is that he is contemplated as a being, who if tried under law would fall, and as such taken in hand in the very rudiments of his moral being, in order that he may be saved. For this purpose is he placed in the hands of parents and teachers, and like a passive lump as he seems to be, yielded up to their control. For this object are his first offenses, and the whole development of his evil self, so hemmed, limited and alleviated, that he may not by one bold act of rebellion against God, with open eyes rise up against the Eternal Throne and be set at once beyond hope by the terrible energy of his first transgression. For this to each man is ordered the checkered history of life's joys and life's sorrows. It is to recover and save. "He looketh upon man, and if any say I have sinned and perverted that which is right and it profiteth me not, He will deliver his soul from going down into the pit." To finish this work, nay, to give the solution to this work, Christ came to suffer and die, and ascend again. But it was for Christ that this world was constructed, and every part of its structure, as well as all the institutions of the family, of society, of government and of law, are framed

to promote the purpose for which Christ was revealed to man. The Lamb of God was slain in the plan of God, before the foundation of the world and the world was made by him and *for* him, that here his work of recovery might go on.

It is then a miserably narrow view of life, and all its structure and its history, to suppose it to have no Christian import, to suppose that no part of it has an important relation to the recovery of the soul, except the preaching of Christ on Sunday, to a man who is under the necessity some time or other to be converted, in order that he may get ready to die and save his soul from perdition. It is a pitiful, nay a contemptible view of life, and of the great social organizations for the training of man, to suppose that they have no relation to God's recovering purposes, and furnish no room for the exercise of Christian principle. In the true Christian view of life, every day is a Sabbath, every meal a feast of thanksgiving, every joy an occasion of praise, and every social gaiety a glad recognition of God. He, on the contrary, who looks upon the great enterprise of life for himself to be, to get through the unpleasant job of being converted, and for his children to get them through it some how or other, and that this is all the connection which Christianity has with the business, the pleasures and the institutions of life, has, to say nothing worse of him, a most paltry and degrading view of the whole subject.

In this work of recovery, the family acts a most important part. For it takes this being in hand, first of all, and has the earliest opportunities to meet him by its influences. Then it takes him in hand when his substance is most susceptible to plastic influences. Then it surrounds and penetrates his being with influences, in their nature the most powerful, influences which are the longest remembered, which cleave and

cling to his being with the most obstinate tenacity, and which even seem to become a part of the very substance of the soul. In addition to all this, the influences are in their very nature disciplinary and corrective, even when they are most perverted, and are capable of the highest religious efficiency. Surely, if the life which we live is constructed for this purpose in all its arrangements and its institutions, and if the family is an agency of such power, then it must be true that the Christian family ought to send out its inmates well-trained Christians, and that this training ought to develop the bud, the blossom, and the fruit, each in its order, and the one as preparatory to the other.

We name another argument for the probable truth of this view. The world is waiting to witness the predicted triumph of Christianity. What is the difficulty. Why tarry its chariot-wheels. Is it for want of numbers. Is it for want of wealth. Is it for want of better and more apostolic organizations. Is it for want of learning. Is it for want of noisy and earnest preachers. Is it for want of busy and even of officious activity on the part of laymen. Is it for want of frequent and violent praying. No, it is not for the want of one or all of these, so much as it is for the want of that resistless, yet quiet attraction, and that noiseless yet sublime power, which there is in *character* harmoniously developed on Christian principles, thoroughly consistent in all its actions, taking to itself as by a right divine, all that perfection in the arts, in sciences and in literature, which Christianity helps forward; and yet humble, meek, self-denying, and ready for a martyr's confession or a martyr's fire. One such man shall chase a thousand, yea, he shall put ten thousand to flight. We look around at this moment upon the state of christendom even in the best parts of it, and what do

we see. Not that there is not enough Christianity, but that it is not of a better quality. We notice how warm and heroic trust in Christ as our example and life is dying away, and in its place, is the cold yet grasping confidence in the great money-god. We see how mammon is not merely giving law to the mightiest monarchs, but penetrating and it would seem ruling the souls of all living men, eating like a canker at the heart of generous affections, and of self-sacrificing purposes, and turning the Christian life into a scramble and study for luxury and comfort, rather than exalting it into a discipline for heaven. We see it dividing the church into two great classes, the rich, who in their study to be richer, forget that there are higher riches than those of earth, and the poor, who in their envy idolize the comforts which are denied them, and so cheat themselves of "the peace of God which passeth understanding." We see how as a consequence *the present life* is in the church, the great object of consideration, and the great mass of professed disciples seem to have relapsed into so delightful a slumber of comfortable living, that it may be asked whether God is not soon to visit his people, with some terrific judgment to teach them that this life is not their rest. Or if there come now and then an interval of zeal and prayer and faith, it is unnatural, tumultuous and violent, and so much so, as soon to tire us out by its convulsive activity, or to disgust us by its unnatural inconsistency. The cause of this inferior quality in our piety, is that it is not early rooted in the first beginnings of our life, that it is not developed in harmonious consistency with the development of the man, that it has to contend with the remains of the earlier life which was lived without Christ, in which evil and degrading habits were formed, and low maxims were adopted, and the whole struc-

ture of the mind was built up on the principles of selfishness and sin. Let there be a change in this respect and we shall see the development of a Christianity, which in the charm of its attractions and in the majesty of its commanding authority, shall possess the world. Let there but go out from the families that are called Christian, a generation which shall have never known the time when God was not honored and Christ was not loved, and the great principles of Christian truth were not recognized and obeyed, a generation whose entire training has been so even and harmonious, that all the recollections and associations of childhood shall suggest nothing but what is favorable to Christian virtue; and there will stand upon the earth such a sacramental host as the world has never seen. Now it is from the fact that the world is waiting for a Christianity that is more consistent with itself, and from the fact that such a Christianity can only be formed in the nursery, that we argue that the expectation encouraged in these discourses is reasonable and of binding force.

The next inquiry which we raise respects the considerations used by the author in support of his doctrine. We had proposed to examine the entire argument of these discourses, and closely to scrutinize its several parts. But this our limits will not allow. We are forced to confine ourselves to those which have attracted the most attention and which have occasioned some controversy.

The first\* which we notice is the

\* We are informed that it has been asserted by some and believed by more, that Dr. B. holds and teaches, that the first moral character is not in all cases sinful, but the training may be so complete and so blessed of God, that there may be no place nor need for conversion in fact. We do not so understand him. If we did, we should seek to show that it is contrary to the induction of experience and the teaching of the Scriptures.

assertion of "something like a law of organic connection as regards character subsisting between" the parent and child. Some five pages of the volume before us are occupied with the illustration and defense of this argument, in the first of the original discourses, and an entire sermon is devoted to it as a separate topic. The use of the word *organic*, in this connection, has occasioned some inquiry and provoked sharp words of criticism. What the author intended by it is explained in the sermon which is devoted to this topic. He there says, "In maintaining the organic unity of the family, I mean to assert, that a power is exerted by parents over children, not only when they teach, encourage, persuade and govern, but without any purposed control whatever. The bond is so intimate that they do it unconsciously and undesignedly—they must do it. Their character, feelings, spirit and principles must propagate themselves, whether they will or not." \* \* \* \* "And thus *whatever* power over character is exerted in families one side of consent in the children, and even before they have come to the age of rational choice, must be taken as organic power, in the same way as if the effect accrued under a law of simple contagion. So too when the child performs acts of will, under parental direction, that involve results of character, without knowing or considering that they do, these must be classed in the same manner." From this explanation, of which we have given but a part, it appears sufficiently clear, that what he means by "organic connection" is the law by which certain unconscious influences are sure in fact to be conveyed from parents to their children,—that these influences *must* tend to a good or evil result in a religious respect, that they *may be turned* to a most important religious service, and that these influences are often more de-

cisive, and of higher moment than those to which a higher importance is attached.

To show how powerful these influences are, that they are more powerful even than any other can be and more decisive, was the object of the author in his first discourses. To magnify and inculcate this importance, he set them forth under the bold and striking figure of those organic laws which in the vegetable and animal bind the material particles together in a unity of the same life, and make one part to feel every influence that befalls the other. We say the "bold and striking figure," for it is clear to us, it was by a figure, and by a figure only, that the term was used, and as such it was to be interpreted by the limitations which would grow out of its subject matter. We do not affirm, that these limitations were clearly expressed. We think they were not. The writer sacrificed accuracy to force. Perhaps he may err not infrequently as a writer, in being fond of "Orphic sayings" which puzzle those who have the means of understanding him most correctly. We are not often offended by these foibles of his, for we hold it good to have "a catholic taste," and there is in his style a freshness and vigor which needs no praise from us. But the best things suffer the most from blemishes, and it is for this reason that we take the liberty of saying, that in propositions which are to serve as texts to hang a series of remarks upon, and which are to be expanded into a lengthened argument, enigmas, however bold and striking, are in more than one sense *inconvenient*.

We have said that in the assertion that these decisive and peculiar influences of the family act by an organic law, the necessary limitations are not given. Those limitations are in this case of a peculiar and incomparable importance. If a man is, or is not guilty for his own sin, and if his holiness must be his own,

to have any moral virtue at all, then it can in no exact or literal sense be true that character as a religious or moral essence is propagated or transmitted by organic law. Influences of the most subtle character may environ the will from the moment of its emergence into a state of moral responsibility. They may be gathered and condensed into an immense and overmastering power before the soul is summoned to what seems to be the unequal encounter. But the moral in man, the will, is yet mightier than they all. They may transmit the prejudices, the sympathies, and the religious creed of the parent, and stamp into the man, the obvious ineffaceable impression of the family likeness, but the soul, the moral self, is still independent in its own freedom. The fact that it is thus independent in its "individualism," while it is surrounded and swayed by these "organic laws" of a social character, is only adequately accounted for by the theory of man, created as under redemptive influences, in order to feel which most completely, he must be met by them so early and be brought so entirely beneath their power, that they seem almost to infringe upon his natural freedom and as it were to destroy his moral responsibility. It is only as we understand that they are organic influences to save, and as we see in them all a design to bless, that we can explain their unequal bearings and solve the mystery of human existence. If it be objected that the organic influences imply a power to curse as well as to bless, we can only say that no man can say that his existence in this world even under the most unfavorable preponderance to evil, is attended with no redeeming tendency, and that the *claim* of the guilty to mercy and especially to more mercy is a contradiction in terms. But this subject we can not argue at length.

It will be conjectured from these

remarks, that we should present the two great facts generalized by Dr. B. as "*organic laws*" and "*individualism*," in relative proportions differing considerably from those in which he employs them. We do not doubt in the least, that the practical tendency of our times has been to give great prominence to the responsibility of the individual man, to the neglect of the real and powerful agency of those social influences, by which we rise and fall together, and in which are found the most indispensable elements of character. To expect a high degree of religious prosperity without availing ourselves of these "*organic laws*" designed by God for man's redemption, is both folly and sin. To neglect those peculiar influences which are designed to prepare the soul for an early and gentle entrance into the kingdom of Christ, and to secure it there by the ties "*light as air but strong as links of iron*," which hold the soul right, because it has never known any other than a conscientious and prayerful life—to neglect these, we say, because perhaps by and by this ungodly and wicked spirit may be broken down into submission, and become the willing servant of Christ, though carrying upon his person the scars worn into him by the fetters and stripes of his bondage, is ignorant and ungrateful. It is ignorant because it argues the want of capacity to discern the real laws of power which God has given us for good; and it is ungrateful because it shows an unwillingness to work in harmony with God, and with the laws of his redeeming power, through a fond attachment to the one way which we prefer. So too, to abandon all those genial methods of Christian culture which are furnished in the refinement, the taste, the intelligence, and the laborious love of a Christian household, in which the soul as truly advances in the life of Christ, as it does in the prayer-

meeting or the revival, is to attempt to unsphere the spirit from the conditions of its life in the body, and to despise as "common" those duties which God has hallowed. Holding then to the good and timely truth of the many forcible illustrations of these topics that abound in this volume, and wishing the book success in its ministrations of counsel suited to the times, we can not but wish that this class of truths had not been exalted at the expense, and by a seeming disparagement of another class. We might illustrate our views by a particular criticism on the remarks upon the *Edwardean* theology, and the revivals since the time of Edwards. We regret that our limits will allow but a single suggestion. As far as these remarks include an *argumentum ad hominem* with those of his opponents who boast that their theology is good because it is old, the reply given by showing that their views have sprung up within a little more than a century, is triumphant and unanswerable. If they shall say, or by silence shall say more emphatically, 'We want no theology, theoretical or practical, older or truer than the *ipsissima verba* of Edwards,' we presume Dr. Bushnell will be very well content to leave them upon this avowal. We deny wholly, however, one inference which seems to be implied in his critique on the New England Theology, and that is, that "angular conversions," "explosive experiences," or spasmodic piety, are more frequently attendant upon the revivals in which a metaphysical theory of conversion is applied, than where it is repelled as inappropriate and profane. On the contrary, we believe it will be found true in fact, as well as explained by sufficient reasons, that in those communities in which there is the most metaphysical scrutiny of the nature and tests of conversion, there the revivals are the most pure, the piety is most rational, and the fruits most consistent.

VOL. VI.

18

tent, graceful and abundant. If we look any where for the most fanatical and repulsive kinds of revivals, with their fruits in delusion and disappointment, we shall find them in those regions where New England Theology is most an offense. Those communities too which will most readily recognize and receive the truths which Dr. B. has advanced, will be the churches trained in the discriminating yet liberal spirit of the New England Theology.

In respect to revivals of religion we feel bound to say a word. In his Argument, Dr. B. has spoken strongly of certain faults which accompany and follow some of the revivals which attend a certain theory of religious training. He has commented with severity and point and justness, upon the piety that is formed on such principles and finds a theater in such scenes. In the volume before us, he has aimed to give a fuller expression of his views on this subject, and to save himself from misconstruction has re-published the article on "The Spiritual Economy of Revivals." In this, he speaks of revivals from an opposite point of view, and shows that they have a powerful agency in the work of man's salvation. He suggests also that they are provided for, by a law as really organic as that of the household, i. e., the law of social influences. Notwithstanding all this, the influence of the volume and of its author has been quoted as decidedly hostile to these scenes of peculiar religious activity and triumph. This can not be done fairly, we are well assured. To show that it can not, would require a more extended argument than we can give, and to save a book like this from every possible misconstruction, is quite beyond our hopes.

There is nothing which we more desire to see, than a thorough discussion of the whole subject of revivals of religion, and of their relations to the progress and piety of

the church. To discuss this subject here would be quite unseasonable. But we must say a word in passing. We look around upon the most favored portions of Christendom, upon the population of any of the purest religious communities, and what do we see? First of all, multitudes living in an ill disguised or avowed contempt of the name, the spirit and the salvation of Christ, earthly, prayerless, hopeless—many of them brutalized by a gross and stupid animalism, or savage by ferocious passion. Others there are, who with an outward respect for religious institutions, show none or next to none of that faith in Christ which cheers and purifies and controls. Of the churches that maintain the word and worship of Christ, one class have no belief in revivals of religion;—neither in that way of preaching, nor in that kind of acting which contemplates any direct influence upon the men that most need to be reached by the gospel. Christianity is with them to show itself most conspicuously by refining the manners, by elevating the tastes, by enlarging the intellect, and by maintaining the charities of life. If in their view it has any farther end to gain, by transforming the character through faith in spiritual realities, that end they believe can best be promoted through its mild social influences. Another class are wedded to the church, and assiduously gather all within its gracious pale, that by the "organic" institutions appointed of Christ—baptism, confirmation, the sacraments and the liturgy—they may attain to a *comfortable* hope of their salvation, and seem to attach to these a higher consequence, than to lay apostolic plans, to preach apostolic sermons, and to carry the apostolic summons to immediate repentance and a preparation of heart for heaven. Another class were once believers in the Gospel as having a converting message, and rejoiced in that direct and manly deal-

ing with men who could think and turn and live. They delighted in those vigorous and personal efforts which arouse the attention of the whole community to an immediate consideration of the Gospel, in its relation to personal character and their eternal destiny. But these churches, where are they? Some are distracted by projects and principles touching slavery, and temperance, and other questions that gender heat and strife. Others are speculating about the theory of revivals. Others are occupied with the various methods of Christian culture, and the important duties which the church owes to her children, to the family, to the school, to the national Congress, and to Mexico. These are all well and important, but what of the force that is to animate and move the church in all these enterprises? Is it said that it makes and gathers strength by *moving*—that it is in obedience to the great laws of social and domestic and religious life—that it is deepening its piety, and drawing nearer to God. But are there signs that this is so? Are the strong and busy men, who have professed Christ, growing more spiritual in their tastes, more chastened and cultivated in their estimate of life, less in haste to be rich, more generous and charitable to their neighbors, more manly and rational in their likeness to Christ? or are they more intensely occupied with the bard and hardening objects of sense, with less and still less of the temper appropriate to the school of Christ? Are the rich men more generous, furnishing with a true benevolence the means of saving their fellow men? or are they less simple hearted and abundant in their gifts, more fond of a vulgar display, or of an exclusive and refined religious attention to themselves, which partakes more of self-culture by self-nursing, than of self-culture by self-denial? Are the poor more or less sordid, more or less contented, more

or less diligent in living for heaven? Are the ministry preaching with a constant and earnest aim to see their hearers converted to a manly but earnest piety—now indirectly, to give cautions and instruction—now directly, as the case may require, but all the while as men intent on results? or are some palsied by despair, others frigid with indifference, others elegant sentimentalists or very popular preachers, others satisfied with holding an orthodoxy which they dare not preach, and but few laying those plans which make their people feel that their preaching means what it purports to say, 'that the soul without the Gospel must die forever?' Is there not a general impression that the style of preaching is changing, and from being manly, close, logical and commanding, it is becoming effeminate, diluted, literary and weak?

If we are told that we are to have no more revivals, but must seek out more appropriate methods of advancing religion—that we must get the power and show the power of our religion by obeying the great laws of activity under which we are placed and by which we thrive; we reply, it is true we must obey these laws, and make our Christianity harmonious with them all, and grow by them all. And it is also true, that the more thorough is the use which the church makes of these divine appointments, the more frequent and more powerful will be its scenes of revival. The more hallowed are our Christian homes by content, by simplicity of life, by intelligence, by a training for Christ—the more they are filled with an atmosphere redolent of heaven; the more vigorous and faithful will be our care for those youth whose homes are anything but Christian, and for those men who, whether their early training were Christian or heathenish, are without Christ, and presiding over homes where Christ is not so much as named. The more vigor-

ous and symmetrical the piety of the head of the Christian household becomes, the more readily and the more efficiently will it act in the church, and when the church uses her united power to arouse the masses of spiritual ignorance and death which wait her movement. The more mature and perfect Christian character becomes, the more power will that character develop when it is seen in its united and social strength. The more the church thrives in its "growth," the more frequently will it go forth in "conquest," and the more numerous and more lasting will be its triumphs. We look then for more frequent, more quiet, and more lasting revivals than we have yet seen, unless the "dry rot" of worldliness, taste and sentimentalism is to consume the pillars of her strength. The power that there is in social sympathies and social strength, is too grand and commanding to be disused. Its possible results, as enlivened and moved by the presence and Spirit of God, are too magnificent in their promise to be relinquished or to be a theme of despair. We regret that we see no more promising signs of the speedy return of such revivals. We regret that the signs of an earnest solicitude for them are no more abundant. We regret most of all that there is so much preaching that has little direct or indirect tendency to promote the great end of the Gospel. We regret that the acquiescence of our religious communities in this state of things is so almost universal. It is well to have an earnest piety, that shall be symmetrical, tasteful, and of the highest culture. It is evil that an earnest piety should be deformed by ill manners, vulgarity, narrowness and cant. But a Christianity that is not earnest, and thus true to its Gospel that it may save the soul, is abhorred of God and ought to be abhorred of men. It is a thing of all others the

most untrue—"the greatest untruth that can be lived"—a profession of all others the most hypocritical, and of course most wearisome, disgusting and unprofitable. Let us have an earnest piety first of all, even if we must have with it vulgarity and cant. And let those who will not sympathize with such a piety, because they must associate with the enthusiastic and vulgar, ask themselves where is their readiness to endure "the reproach of Christ," which has been endured in *this very form* by all his followers from the first.

The last inquiry which we raise concerns the reception which these discourses have met with, at the hands of several classes of Christians. This inquiry is one of some interest, inasmuch as they have attracted a wider attention than is usual. It is one of the rarest of occurrences, that a book written by a clergyman of one denomination is thought to be of so much consequence by so great a variety of other sects. If it assails a sect at a single point, we expect of course a notice and reply. If it attack a principle which is common to several, we look, that they make a common cause, in the defense. This work does neither of these things. It has to do with a truth of universal interest and of high practical concern, and yet it has awakened the attention and received the commendation or criticism of almost every leading sect in the land. It is a hopeful sign to the lover of truth to feel that truth may reach beyond the bounds of a limited circle, and can find its way to the heart and reason of our common nature.

The Baptist denomination have received the principles as might be expected. For though not in form, it is yet in fact an able vindication of the propriety of the rite of infant baptism, by showing that it has a significance in the constitution of a Christian family, and in the rela-

tions of a child born in a Christian house. The strength of the argument for this rite, which is proved in the Scriptures by inferences, strong and numerous indeed, and yet only inferences, is to be found in its meaning. The doctrine of these discourses is little else than an argument to show that there is such a significance in one of the most important organizations subordinate to the Christian church. That organization is the Christian family, which may be said to be the ante-room, or the vestibule to the inner sanctuary. There are side-doors, it is true, that none may be shut out; but this is designated by the law of nature and owned by the laws of redemption, as the entrance appointed of God. To initiation therein, there is appointed a rite, symbolizing the privileges and hopes which gather about the infant that is admitted through its portals. Our Baptist brethren have resisted and do still resist the inference from this position. Much will be gained if they receive new views of the thing signified, if they acquire livelier and deeper impressions of the principles for which they reject the rite.

We have little expectation that an Episcopalian critic can ever look at any doctrine except to see how far it agrees or disagrees with what is taught by the church. He may be impressed by a candid and graceful manner, and have sympathy with a strong and earnest mind; but he seems to reason almost always with the major premise fixed and unquestioned, that what is provided by the church is true, important and divine. Not only must he hold that it is true, but that it includes all truth. We are not at all surprised at the interest taken in this book by Episcopalians, nor at the grounds on which that interest rests, nor at the considerations by which it is justified. They are pleased with the doctrine, for the same reasons that the Baptists dislike it. For they exalt infant bap-

tion just as really as the Baptists reject the rite. Their only complaint is, that Dr. B. does not go far enough. They would have him not only show that there is a fundamental reason for the rite in that great law of providence, by which a Christian character ought to be presumed, in a baptized child, but wish him to assert that an actual change is secured in connection with the rite by regeneration. By this they mean, that the elements or seeds of this change are imparted in baptism by the Holy Spirit, which if improved, will result in salvation. Dr. Bushnell attaches no such consequence to baptism. He esteems the thing which Baptism signifies, i. e., the Christian training and its blessings. This he esteems to be so important, that it is worthy to be symbolized and expressed by a rite. But he does not tie nor limit the blessing to the rite, if the thing, i. e., the training, be secured. The one man believes in the spiritual power, and in the form because it represents the power. The other believes in the form because it is through the form that the power is imparted. Here is precisely the distinction between formal and spiritual Christianity. The assertion of this distinction, is enough in our view, to show on which side lies the truth.

While Dr. Bushnell is complimented that he approximates so nearly to the truth, "as it is in the church," on the subject of Christian nurture, he is also advised that he has neglected to consider the child in his relations to the church. The simple reason for this is, that his subject did not render this appropriate. Were he to write a book on the relations of the church to the Christian child, it might be expected that he should treat of the subject. Should he do so, he would doubtless define the church, not as that body which is provided with three orders in the ministry, but as "a congregation of faithful men in which the

pure word of God is preached and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all these things that of necessity are requisite to the same." But we do not propose to argue with the Episcopalian on this point. That he should measure every principle and doctrine by the degree of its conformity with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, as constituted by the General Convention, is no more than we expect. We are not at all surprised at this. We choose to adopt another standard.

An amiable yet able critic of the Discourses, appeared in the person of Dr. Nevin, a leading divine of the German Reformed Church. His criticism was generous and discriminating, and is strikingly contrasted in respect to its dignified and Christian spirit with certain notices which have emanated from New England, and we are ashamed to say, from our own denomination. The critic hails the work not only as valuable in itself, but as a cheering sign of a swerving from that extreme 'individualism' which he regards as the great fault of Puritanism, conceiving that Puritanism is regardless of those powerful social, religious laws and institutions in which is more than half of our life. This estimate of the New England Theology and religionism, which is so freely expressed by Drs. Nevin and Schaf, we think is quite overstrained and exaggerated. We doubt not, if these gentlemen would come to New England oftener and acquaint themselves with us as we are—if they would hear our preachers, and see the workings of our religious system, they would see another set of Christians than those which they conceive of at a distance. They might find us something more than a set of skeletons—with clothing hanging on us as upon scarecrows; all loose and frightful and grotesque. They might see instead of these, human beings with the feelings of men and

the warm hearts of Christians. Our preaching they might discover to consist of something more than metaphysical dogmas, alike unintelligible and repulsive. Our religious life might appear to blend with some degree of grace, with the charities and duties of life, and not to be altogether too impracticable for weak human nature. In short, we wish that these gentlemen would visit the Yankees more, instead of looking at them through the medium of hereditary German prejudices, united with a little of the disdain, which may be pardoned in a German *Gelehrte*. Let them remember too, that the reports about New England Theology are liable to a little deflection and reduplication, as they cross the state of New Jersey, and that we by no means trust our Princeton brethren as perfect *conductors* of intelligence in relation to what we believe. Perhaps they will discover too, that the character of no school of New England Theology is more rationalistic than that of their own. At all events, let them remember that *Pantheistic* and *Rationalistic* are interchangeable coin, and a brass guinea is likely to be returned in brass farthings. But if there is any thing good which they can teach us in criticism, in ecclesiastical history or in science, we will learn of them, without imposing on them the condition of learning any thing good from us.

Of the *Congregationalist* criticisms on our author we hardly know what to say. Dr. Tyler's letter, is on the whole good natured in its tone and manner, but we think neither fair nor generous in its strictures. It is open to two grand objections. First, it shows no just and hearty interest in the important truth which is advanced, and little hearty desire to give that truth a wide circulation; and second, it places the most unfavorable construction on the passages, expressions and illustrations, which would

admit of a construction that was good. These are two capital faults in our judgment. In respect to the personal questions which have unhappily arisen between Dr. Bushnell and the writer, we have nothing to say.

We are still less satisfied by the criticisms on the work in another section of New England. The contemptuous manner in which the author is treated, the decided implication that he is not a "safe" man, the more pointed insinuation, that the advertisement that the book was published at the request of the Association of ministers before whom it was read, was not true, and all these followed by the strangest freedoms with the argument, the style, and the good name of a man whom the clergymen of Boston have some reason to treat with respect, are offenses too gross against all the laws of generous and gentlemanly warfare, not to deserve and to receive our distinct reprobation. We are obliged to withdraw the compliment, expressed in a notice of this controversy in our last number. If this is the way in which the truth is to be defended in Massachusetts and orthodoxy is to be represented, we have only to express our regret. The perusal of some of the criticisms from quarters where the author had no reason to expect any thing but fair dealing, has enabled us to understand the peculiar circumstances of provocation under which he prepared his "Argument."

From another quarter, where Dr. Bushnell might with reason expect some honest suspicions of his orthodoxy, the book was received in a manner entirely the opposite. As we have read the criticisms in the Christian Mirror, we have felt thankful that a New England man could be generous and fair in appreciating what is good from a writer whom he supposed to differ from himself. The fact too that this critic, found not only so much that

might bear a favorable construction, but so very much that was true, important and strikingly expressed, has given us greater confidence in our own opinion, which otherwise we ought to suspect, that some of Dr. B.'s New England critics preferred the worse to the more favorable judgment.

After this checkered game of cross-firing on the part of the so-called orthodox in New England—after each interest had taken its position, and so many of them against the book and all for the cause of truth—it is quite amusing to see the Princeton Review come forward as an arbiter and final umpire. We may be mistaken, but we suppose it is very silently allowed by these lower judicatories, that this Princeton Review is a kind of 'Supreme Court of Errors' in respect to matters of faith. Well, the crier has opened the court, and we see the censors from Connecticut, from Boston and Portland, all eager to hear the ruling of this tribunal, accustomed to speak as "one having authority." And what do they hear? Alas, "wo to them who go down into Egypt for help;"—the decision is more than half clear and full for Dr. Bushnell. \*

This Princeton criticism however, is quite a curiosity in its way. It opens with a recognition of the leading idea of the discourses, as that of "organic as distinguished from individual life." It does not exactly like the shape in which it is presented, but the truth in it is "as familiar to Presbyterians as household words," and "has power to give his discourses very much of an 'Old School' cast and to render them in a high degree attractive and hopeful in our estimation." This organic life which has been attacked with such vigor by the New England critics, at once commends it to favor at Princeton; and so much so, that the organic connection between the New England and

the Presbyterian churches, is given as the first reason why the work demands a notice!

The critic then speaks of the truths which give value to the publication—"First, the fact that there is such a divinely constituted relation between the piety of parents and that of their children, as to lay a scriptural foundation for a confident expectation in the use of the appointed means, that the children of believers will become truly the children of God." "A second truth preëminently presented by our author is that parental nurture, or Christian training is the great means for the salvation of the children of the church." Some eighteen pages are devoted to the discussion of these topics. He then proceeds, "There is a third feature of this little tract which gives it great interest and importance in our view. Dr. Bushnell can not sustain his view of the intimate connection between the religion of parents and that of their children, without advancing doctrines which we regard as of great value, and which according to his testimony and other sources of evidence, have been very much lost sight of especially in New England." \* \* \* \* "The pillars of this false and superficial system are overturned in Dr. Bushnell's book. He has discovered that 'Goodness (holy virtue) or the production of goodness is the supreme end of God.'—p. 34. 'That virtue must be the product of separate and absolutely independent choice is pure assumption.'—p. 31. He on the contrary asserts, that 'virtue is rather a state of being than an act or series of acts.'—p. 31. What mighty strides are here!" Mighty strides, from what? From that strange and persevering misconception of the New England Theology, which seems to be 'imputed and transmitted' to the Princeton theologians. On what is the conclusion founded that such strides are made by Dr. Bushnell? On parts of sentence

ees, written for other purposes than as a formal exposition of philosophical opinions, and to be interpreted by the laws of popular and not of philosophical language. Without attempting to defend or criticise Dr. Bushnell's language, we disclaim and deny that the meaning conveyed by this writer, in his use of these quotations, is a true or just representation of the principles of any school of New England Theology.

After this outburst of enthusiasm, the critic proceeds to remark upon certain passages in which Dr. Bushnell speaks well of certain forms of statement in the Westminster confession, because they were founded on and sought to express the great truth for which he contends, naming particularly the doctrines of "federal headship and original or imputed sin." By a very pleasant dexterity he takes occasion to reason, as though this were a proof positive, that the real truth in the case, was that which the confession teaches, and that this real truth had nearly been lost sight of in New England. All of which proves to us that of which we have had abundant reason to be convinced beforehand, that if the Princeton gentlemen possess all truth and all wisdom, upon every other subject, they have never yet been able to show their truth or wisdom by attaining to a just conception or description of the New England Theology.

After thus almost giving Dr. B. the right hand of fellowship, and taking him into the inner mysteries that are taught at Princeton, the critic proceeds with great deliberation to turn him out again, by discovering that his doctrine is in fact little better than naturalism, or rationalism. Letting Dr. Bushnell's solemn and explicit asseverations to the contrary go for nothing, though he recognizes them distinctly; he concludes the first portion of his argument with quotations from two German Rationalists, Hase and

Wegscheider, we suppose to show the coincidence of language or sentiment. That they do show it we have failed to see. We certainly think that a quotation from the reviewer himself ought to be given to complete the square of coincidences in naturalistic doctrines. "There is," says the Princeton reviewer, "a natural adaptation in all means of God's appointment, to the end they are intended to accomplish. There is an appropriate connection between sowing and reaping, between diligence and prosperity, truth and holiness, religious training and the religious life of children." Here is naturalism, as clear as the sunlight. How then, it may be asked, can the Princeton reviewer be a supernaturalist? Because, to use his own language, he refers "the connection between the religion of parents and that of their children," "to the promise of God and his blessing on faithful parental training." And when Dr. Bushnell briefly describes his own theory "by natural laws inhabited by supernatural agencies" —what right has his critic to say that Dr. B. is a whit less of a supernaturalist than himself, or to say that his theory is nothing more than that which "resolves it into a law of nature, accounting for the connexion in question in the same way or on the same principles, which determine the transmission of other forms of character from parent to children?"

But as the reviewer progresses in his argument to prove Dr. B. a rationalist, he waxes stronger, just as he did in going from step to step in making him a Princetonian. He speaks "of the ridicule which he heaps on the idea of any immediate interference of the Spirit of God," in a way which in our view is unjust and ungenerous. He then thinks no honest account can be given for his pleasing the Unitarians, and finally brings this argument which has ascended up to the point

which made Dr. B. almost a Calvinist of the straitest sect, and then has descended till it has made him almost a Unitarian, to a very significant practical conclusion, viz. "that there is enough of a rationalistic cast about it to account for all the disapprobation it has excited, and to justify the course of the Massachusetts Committee." This and a word of notice for Dr. Tyler, is all the comfort that it gives to its New England brethren. The ingenuity of the article certainly seems to be its most remarkable merit, and we think much credit is due to it for the degree of success with which it has endeavored to argue in directions so opposite and to satisfy interests so diverse.

The Massachusetts Sabbath School Society deserve a word. The only notice which this Committee have taken of Dr. Bushnell's argument is, we are informed, to pass and transmit a resolution, relinquishing all claim to the copyright of "the Discourses." This vote was communicated to Dr. B. with no comment or explanation, except that contained in a formal preamble. This strikes us as rather a cool proceeding, and perhaps it was designed to show that they received the Argument "coolly." The relinquishment of the copyright, by the way, was a little "supererogatory," inasmuch as the title to it had never been wholly yielded by him, so that there is not even the slender justice or courtesy of which there is a show.

Some argument and some indignation has been expressed by the defenders of the Committee, that it should be asserted that they had designed to "suppress the book," as if any body had supposed that the Committee would think of hiding or killing the dangerous thing, after they had got it into their power. We assure those who think it worth the while to defend the Committee against this charge, that among the unfavorable judgments that have

been passed upon their conduct, we never heard that they were suspected of being capable of a purpose so weak as this. But we ask, is it nothing to receive, examine with great deliberation, and finally to conclude to publish, a work from a man like the author, and then quietly to stop the sale and give no reason either to him or the public. If they had objected to the sentiments of the original manuscript, or had thought it a work unsuitable for their society and had said so, this would have been manly and fair. If having decided to publish it at the end of a long deliberation; they had then discovered, even at the suggestion of critics from another state, or by the objections of their patrons nearer home, that the sentiments were doubtful or obscurely expressed, or would expose them to embarrassing controversies or suspicions, and on any or all of these grounds had concluded to issue no more copies, and had given the grounds of this change of opinion to Dr. B. and the public, this would have been just to the author, the public and themselves, however little credit it might gain to their fitness to pass an independent judgment on an unpublished manuscript. But to stop the book and give no reason, is to treat the author and the public with too little consideration, and argues a liberty of judging and of disposing of a man's good name, which is not usually entrusted to committees, and which ought to be exercised by none. Whose character is safe, whose opinions may not be marked, if a committee holding a position of so much influence, can thus dispose of character and pronounce upon opinions, without being held to answer to any tribunal? And is this manifest wrong, both in principle and in the method of its exercise, to be slurred over, by defending the Committee from a charge which no one could think of making? Certainly not. We respect the Committee and the Society

of which they are the organ, but we must take the leave to say, that while we concede to them the entirest freedom in judging for themselves on the merits of the work, and also in reversing any judgments which they may have pronounced; and while too we believe that they must be far better able to judge of the fitness of, a work for Boston and Massachusetts than we can be; still we can not concede to them the right to deal in this way with any man's good name. In the name of all fair dealing and good manners and Christian courtesy, we protest against it.

As patriotic New Englanders, we have a natural pride in our metropolis. As provincial to Boston, we may be expected to defer to the judgments which issue from our lawful capital. But we can not so far defer to these decisions as to be content that they shall dispose of our reputation for orthodoxy in this summary manner, and that our brethren shall capitally condemn us, without trial and without an appeal.

We profess also a strong interest in the faith and principles which we hold in common with our orthodox brethren at Boston. Feeling thus, our concern and interest is not a little sensitive that this faith may be defended by honorable methods, and that a concern for the truth, may never betray into a neglect of the plain maxims of common justice. We confess our mortification that this zeal for the truth has been exposed to the Unitarian body, in actions so undignified;—that a book so interesting and useful as this, has been laid aside, and not a reason has been rendered, nor a fault has been specified;—so that when the uninitiated ask, 'If this book be heretical, what is orthodoxy, and what is it to be sound in the faith?' the only answer that they can receive, is, 'A man is orthodox when he is orthodox! and sound in the faith when he is sound!'

We are still more mortified that it should have been suggested or confessed as a sufficient reason to condemn the book, that the Unitarians are pleased with it, and it can not therefore be either sound or honest. The Unitarians may all be very artful and dishonest men for aught we know. Our Boston brethren ought to know better than we. But it is hardly expedient to tell them so, nor is it either wise or politic to talk of them in this way as a class of men who can not be trusted.

This talking of them as a class, in terms expressive of suspicion and horror, or the dividing them into subordinate divisions according to their relative claims to soundness in the faith or true piety, has always seemed to us a liberty utterly unwarrantable and offensive. Are they not men, and as such are they not to be supposed to have reasons for their opinions, and to hold them on some distinct grounds? As men too may they not be reasoned with, and is there any way of approaching them with hope, except as you concede to them, in form at least, the power of judging, and the capacity of feeling the force of an argument. If they have a wrong and deficient system, as we believe they have, it is a very plain and simple business to tell them what we believe and why we believe it, and to show them why their system is deficient and wherein. If they are our friends and neighbors, it is a Christian duty which we owe to them, to meet them in the religious as we do in the social world, with some show of friendly concern, that we may have a common faith. We ought to believe them capable of changing their opinions.

Besides, we hope the time may come when they will change. We do not expect that they will do this all at once, but that they may look at the Christian faith with less and less prejudice, and with a full and still fuller consent to all its princi-

plies. If that time should have already come with any, and we not be aware of it, it is quite ungracious to take the very sign of their conversion, as a ground of reproach against the book or the man who has been the means of it, and to repel every token of a common way of thinking, or every sign which indicates an approach to it, by repulsive and suspicious attitudes. These seem to us very plain and simple principles, and we regret that they have been sinned against in the present controversy.

\* \* \* \* \*

In taking leave of this book, we

say distinctly to our readers, that it has not been our object to criticise the whole volume, or to sift every expression, illustration or opinion even, advanced by its author. There are expressions which we think might have been altered for the better, illustrations which might have been improved, and opinions which are hastily ventured and not well defended. The doctrine of the book as we understand it, we think to be true and important. The leading arguments we have noticed, as far as they seemed to call for our criticism, and the reception of the work has seemed worthy of comment.

#### THE FINANCIAL CRISIS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

THE bankruptcy of several hundred of the most eminent commercial firms of Great Britain, the almost entire prostration of private credit, the depreciation of public stocks to the extent of one-fifth their nominal value, and a much greater decline in the market value of railway and other securities,—and the extreme embarrassment of the Bank of England, are events which can not fail to arrest the attention of every intelligent man in the community. Eighteen months since, the nation was apparently in the most prosperous condition, every operative being employed, and every branch of industry fully developed; while at the present time, the prostration of the commercial and manufacturing interests is more complete and universal than at any previous period within a quarter of a century, unless possibly in the year 1825.

We propose to examine in a brief and rather desultory manner, the causes and probable results of this state of things. We enter upon this work with diffidence, as we are aware that our distance from the

theater of these events, may prevent us from estimating correctly the subject in some of its relations. Still we believe that this distance, and the consequent exemption from personal interest in the matter, may enable us to take a more calm and accurate view of the course of events, than can easily be formed by an actor and sufferer.

Two causes have been almost uniformly assigned by the English and American press for the state of things to which we have referred;—the exportation of the precious metals in payment for food, and the immense investments in railways. To both these causes a part of the calamity is without doubt to be ascribed; but in our remarks we shall give the precedence to two or three others.

We suspect that the cause to which, more than any other, the mischief is to be attributed is, that a large part of the middling and higher classes have for a long series of years 'lived beyond their means.' It has excited universal surprise that so large a proportion of the bankrupt houses have proved to be utterly

rotten. Several, whose indebtedness amounted to from three to eight millions of dollars, had not sufficient property in their hands to pay twenty-five cents on the dollar, and, as is now ascertained, had been in this situation for many years. The individuals composing these houses lived in the most expensive manner. In many cases these parties having abundant credit, and being utterly insolvent, made from time to time extravagant speculations in branches foreign to their regular business, and thus became more and more irretrievably involved. How far such habits of extravagance have pervaded these classes of the British community, it is of course impossible to say; but beyond question they have existed to an extent far greater than would be believed by a careless observer. It is well known that many of the nobility are involved in debt to an enormous and embarrassing degree; so that, their landed estates being entailed, their incomes are sequestered for the benefit of their creditors. The late Duke of York at the time of his death was in debt several millions of dollars, and if we recollect right, his estate paid a very small dividend. It is not a very uncommon thing to find the name of a nobleman in the list of bankrupts in "the Gazette."

As these habits of reckless extravagance have been prevalent to a great extent and for many years, it is evident that their results must be almost equally disastrous to the debtor and the creditor, and must exert a ruinous influence upon the community. When the custom of paying debts promptly and equitably is universal in a community, goods will be sold at fair prices, and purchased with prudence. If on the other hand it is considered doubtful whether debts will be paid, the purchaser will readily buy any amount of goods, from any one who will trust him, whether he requires them or not, and the seller will charge a

sufficient advance to cover the risk. Of course the national industry will, so far as it is influenced by the state of things alluded to, be directed in a useless and perhaps injurious channel. It is unnecessary to refer in addition to the ruinous effect upon the integrity of the community, which is thus produced.

We regard, as another cause of this wide-spread calamity, the immense extension of commercial credit and indebtedness. After the convulsion of 1837 in our own country, when we had sufficiently recovered from it to begin to examine its causes, we were unanimous in assigning as the most prominent and efficient, the extensive operations upon fictitious capital; which capital was to a great extent furnished by banking institutions in different parts of the country. In England, unless we are much mistaken, precisely the same effect has been produced, though in a different manner. Individual houses have taken the position, and accomplished the results, produced in this country by banks in the period alluded to; their notes and acceptances, from time to time paid and replaced by others, being always in the market to a very large amount, have accomplished the purpose of bank notes in every particular, except one, that of a circulating medium. Every one knows that whether business is conducted in the most healthy and prudent manner, or with extreme recklessness, the paper of individual houses, and bank notes and credits, must constitute the available assets of the mercantile community. In the former state of things, however, these assets have real convertible value; in the latter they pass currently until the crisis, the day of reckoning, comes, and they are then found to equal in value "the baseless fabric of a vision."

We do not subscribe to the celebrated denunciation of General Jackson against all "men who trade on borrowed capital," but we fully

believe that in most cases, when the result is not averted by unusual industry and prudence, they will 'break.' In the memorable year referred to in our own history, when matters were *settled up*, it was found that the whole property of many banking institutions consisted in the promissory notes of insolvent merchants, while the property of a large proportion of the mercantile community was represented by the notes of these banks and of other merchants equally insolvent. Of course a common ruin involved both classes, leaving here and there one who with extreme difficulty kept his head above water. In London, the settling day has now arrived. Multitudes whose credit had been for many years, in some cases for half a century, unquestioned, are found to be irretrievably insolvent; and their bills constitute the whole assets of an almost innumerable company of smaller houses. We are aware that the commercial business of London is enormously extended, and that a large part of the commerce of the globe is consummated in that city; still when we learn the vast indebtedness of many of the insolvent houses, and estimate from them the liabilities of the much greater number who still continue to meet their engagements, we can not doubt but that a very large proportion of the bills floating in the great commercial metropolis, are what are styled in vulgar mercantile parlance, *kites*—let fly to raise money and not in settlement of real transactions.

We would suggest as another cause of these embarrassments, the investment of large sums of money in securities and other kinds of property in foreign countries. It was stated that the bankruptcy of one house was caused by their having more than half a million sterling locked up in sugar estates in the Mauritius, and that a large part of this vast sum would be a total loss. Other houses held immense amounts

of Mexican bonds, Spanish bonds, the stocks issued by some of our insolvent states, and other unavailable securities of a similar nature. Investments of this nature have not recently been made with such extravagant folly as in 1825; still the amount thus held by houses in London, could it be ascertained, would occasion universal astonishment.

An inadequate currency has, we think, assisted in producing this result. While the commerce of the country has been steadily increasing for many years past, the currency, by which we mean specie and notes of the Bank of England, has either remained stationary or been contracted in amount. When the Bank of England was rechartered in 1844, a radical change was made in the principles on which its circulation should be regulated. Our limits will not permit us to state the changes thus made by Sir Robert Peel's celebrated bill; their result is, that as the specie held by the Bank diminishes, that institution is compelled to contract its circulation, and of course to diminish its discounts. It is almost universally conceded by the leading journals and reviews, that the system works badly, and that its practical operation has contributed a large share towards producing the present state of things.

The large importations of food from foreign countries have unquestionably exerted a powerful influence in effecting the present distress. If they have not been the ultimate cause; if the extravagance, the overtrading, and the other particulars which we have mentioned, have produced unsoundness and disease in the commercial body politic, the large exportations of specie consequent on these importations have without doubt brought the disease to a head, and accelerated a result which otherwise might have possibly been delayed for many years. Still it appears to us unquestionably true, that had the financial interests of

Great Britain been in a healthy state, the evil resulting from the purchases of bread stuffs would have been so small in comparison with the present terrible prostration, that they would hardly have been worth regarding. These bread stuffs have actually been paid for to a large extent by sending on our state stocks and other securities to be sold in this country ; and the balance might have been liquidated by the sale of manufactured goods and other property, and by loans upon the continent, had not the evil influences which we have mentioned, prevented that healthy action which was necessary to the relief of the country.

It has been stated that the calls for money for the construction of railways, have amounted during the present year to more than one hundred and fifty million dollars. To withdraw this vast sum from the ordinary channels of trade and investment, must at any time interrupt the usual course of business and produce embarrassment, especially as these investments are for the time wholly unproductive ; and it is perfectly evident that the extent of this embarrassment must have been greatly increased from the co-operation of the other evil influences which we have been considering. It must be remembered however, that this large amount of money has been expended in payment for British iron and British labor ; that the amount of money in the kingdom is not diminished by these payments ; and that the inconvenience thus resulting would be partial and temporary, if the mercantile community were in other respects in a healthy condition. Did our limits permit, we should be disposed to examine the general systems of British railways, and their effect upon the shareholders and the community ; but this is a field into which we can not at this time enter.

We had proposed to consider the probable results of the events which have thus passed under our review.

Some of the most obvious we will suggest briefly ; but with regard to other particulars about which we might be inclined to speculate, we are restrained by the consciousness that before these pages meet the eye of our readers, events may have transpired which would render our speculations futile.

Like every other storm which devastates the natural or the political and social world, this tornado will in time exhaust its strength and blow over. Although to a reader of daily journals private credit seems entirely prostrated, we have reason to believe that hardly one mercantile firm in a hundred, has actually become bankrupt. The amount of solid wealth in Great Britain, consisting of land, buildings, shipping and merchandize, is enormously great ; and this fact properly appreciated, will soon inspire confidence, and reviving confidence will in time make money sufficiently abundant. Still the thousands who have become bankrupt, and the vastly greater number whose property is seriously impaired, will long have occasion to remember the crisis of 1847. We regret to say, that we fear that the sufferings of the poorer classes during the present winter, both in Great Britain and Ireland, will be extreme. The high price of food, the great number in the manufacturing districts partially or wholly unable to obtain work, the multitudes of laborers on railways thrown suddenly out of employment, the impaired means of multitudes whose charities have heretofore mitigated the pressure of poverty, the disorganization and lawlessness of Ireland, and the general want of heart and hope in the community, present a picture which we are unwilling to look upon.

How far the events of this year will lessen the confidence of the world in British stability and integrity, we can not at present fully determine. We will barely suggest to the thoughtful reader whether there are not causes in operation,

which will diminish, to say the least, the pre-eminence of Great Britain as a commercial and manufacturing people among the nations of the earth. Into the consideration of these causes we may be disposed to enter at a future time.

It may be well in concluding our remarks on the financial crisis of Great Britain, to speak of its effects upon our own country. Owing to the season of the year in which the principal bankruptcies took place, and to some other causes, the direct loss experienced by our fellow citizens has been much less than we should have anticipated, when we consider the intimate and very extensive commercial relations between the two nations. The depression of business in England however, has occasioned a great decline in the value of our staple productions, particularly of cotton, which will be severely felt in this country, particularly at the south. We have also had as the direct result of this state of things in Great Britain, a serious pressure for money and increase in its market value, in some of our large cities. But as we regard this pressure as artificial and transitory, and as it has not occasioned prostration of private credit, we trust its effect upon our merchants will on the whole, be favorable, particularly as it will diminish the importation of foreign goods, and induce caution in forming new engagements.

If we have judged correctly re-

specting the causes of these troubles of our transatlantic friends, we may derive one lesson from our review of them,—a lesson which the events that transpired among us ten years since, taught even more impressively; *to avoid overtrading and extravagance*. During the five years past the people of the United States have, with hardly an exception or an interruption, been prosperous in all the various branches of industry, and have accumulated wealth and developed the national resources to an extent which our most intelligent citizens can hardly appreciate or realize. Much of the wealth acquired has been employed in the payment of debts previously incurred, or has been expended for valuable and productive property, such as manufactoryes and railroads. Probably at no previous time was the great mass of the people more free from embarrassing debt than at this moment. Whether this state of things shall continue, depends in part upon many things connected with the action of government, and of foreign nations; but the cause most influential and potent is within our own control; we shall determine for ourselves, and our determination will decide the future prosperity of our country, whether we will shun or imitate the example of speculative folly, extended and baseless commerce, and extravagance in the habits of life, which we have been considering.

#### SHORT NOTICES.

*Traill's New Translation of Josephus.*—Mr. George Virtue, 26 John street, New York, has in course of publication, "The Works of FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, an entirely new translation, by the Rev. ROBERT TRAILL, D.D., M.R.I.A., &c. &c., with notes and explanatory essays, by ISAAC TAYLOR, of Ongar; accompanied by numerous steel engravings, illustrating the scenes of the history;

with Medallion Heads of the personages mentioned by Josephus, from the only authentic sources." The illustrations are from an eminent artist, who spent nearly a year in Palestine for the sole purpose of obtaining them; and the engravings are among the finest specimens of the art. But that in which our readers will justly feel the deepest interest, is the character of the transla-

tion. In this there is manifestly a very great improvement upon Whiston's version, both in point of style, and fidelity to the original. Mr. Virtue publishes this edition, agreeably to an arrangement with the representatives of the translator, who lost his life by his indefatigable exertions to relieve the sufferings of his parishioners, during the late distressing famine in Ireland; and a portion of the profits go to the benefit of his family. Those who can overlook this consideration, and the superior style of this splendid edition, may supply themselves, we understand, with an inferior article, with which the enterprise of Mr. Virtue is forced to contend.

*Williston on the Sabbath.*—Mr. William G. Hooker, of New Haven, Conn., has just published a new edition of the "Five Discourses on the Sabbath, preached at Durham, N. Y., by the Rev. Seth Williston, D.D., and first given to the public in 1813." This he has done with the consent of the author, who has given it a careful revision; and he now offers to furnish it in quantities of not less than *one hundred copies*, at cost, to those who may wish to circulate it gratuitously, and for a small profit, to those who purchase for sale. With this view, he has caused the work to be stereotyped. His object is, "to promote the better observance of the Lord's day, rather than pecuniary advantage." We need not commend this laudable design to the attention of the friends of the Sabbath, by speaking of the merits of Dr. Williston's work, which has long been before the public, and justly esteemed as a popular, yet able argument for the Christian Sabbath.

*Todd's Shorter Catechism.*—J. H. Butler, Northampton, Mass., has published the first volume, 18mo, of a series, entitled, "The Shorter Catechism illustrated, by John Todd, D.D." This work is designed to aid parents and teachers in the diffi-

cult task of bringing the whole Catechism within the comprehension of children, and investing its study with the necessary interest. With this in view, the author has connected with each question, an illustrative tale; which bears the marks of his well known power over the youthful mind. If the succeeding volumes shall equal the first, we can, in advance, congratulate him upon the complete success of his difficult undertaking.

☞ The unexpected length of several articles, obliges us to postpone the notices of other works which we had prepared for this number.

**NOTE.—*The Common School Controversy in Massachusetts.***—The author of a pamphlet, containing four letters to the Rev. Heman Humphrey, D.D., to whom unfavorable allusion was made in an article with the above title, contained in our last Number, has sent us an extended vindication of himself, which he desires us to publish. It would be so entirely inconsistent with the plan of the New Englander, to admit a personal controversy between writers, that we must shun every thing which can possibly be construed into a precedent for such a course. Had we known at first the name of the respondent, we should have been unwilling to suspect that he could be guilty of any measures, in the slightest degree dishonorable, for promoting an object, however dear and important. And now with his explanation of the facts before us, we think he has successfully exonerated himself from such an imputation. This expression of opinion, we hope will have the effect of doing him full justice, with those few persons, to whom an anonymous writer's name can be known. At the same time, he will pardon us for saying, in justice to the author of the article, that the facts, as understood and stated by him, fully justify the view which was taken of his course.

THE  
NEW ENGLANDER.

No. XXII.

APRIL, 1848.

THE BRITISH SYSTEM OF POSTAGE.

THE people of the United States are very poorly informed as to the nature and bearings of the British system of postage, first devised by Mr. Rowland Hill. They look at it only through the medium of pre-conceived notions, and compare it with the present system as if it were only an amendment of the latter. Whereas in fact it is an entirely new system. Its adoption was, so far, a revolution. It introduces a new set of principles, and a new current of ideas. Mr. Hill himself was not entirely divested of old notions, and therefore, in commending his system to public favor, he endeavored to show that it would produce as much revenue, in five years' time, as the old system. But the practical statesmen who took up the scheme as a measure of the government, Lord Melbourne and Mr. Francis Baring, better understood its radical character, and boldly avowed that they were constrained to adopt it because the people demanded it, and the public good would be promoted by it, and because it was demonstrated that the old system was incapable of meeting the wants of the country, and had fallen utterly behind the spirit of the age. They were therefore satisfied that a radical change of

feeling was the only change that afforded a rational prospect of success. They would therefore reduce the rate of postage at once to the lowest rate proposed, and would have the post-office henceforth conducted as a public convenience and not as a means of making money for the government. Hence the inquiry is continually before the department—How can the public convenience be better promoted than it is? Never is the question raised—By what vexatious interference with the free use of the mail can a little more money be made for the government? A letter is never scrutinized by prying clerks to see if it does not contain another letter to somebody else. The infallible scales determine at once how much the government is entitled to, and as they render no more service, they ask no more pay on account of the nature and objects of the contents. And when a letter is once put into the mail, and the postage paid, the department is then bound for its delivery, although it may go to a dozen offices before finding its owner, without additional charge. And so indefatigable are the subordinates of the department, that they rarely miss of finding a man if he is in the kingdom. We know

the case of a gentleman from the West, who went to London, but neglected to give his family any directions as to the sending of letters. His wife addressed him in London, and the letter had not been three days in town before the carrier found him out, a stranger among two millions of people. That is very unlike an American post-office. In like manner a newspaper that is once put into the mail, may be re-mailed until it is worn out, without ever being charged with postage.

Being satisfied that nothing but information is wanting to arouse the people of this country to secure for themselves the same precious boon of cheap postage, which has proved so great a blessing in England, we have looked about for new sources of information to spread before our readers. The debates in Parliament on this subject have probably never been read in this country by any eye except our own. In them the whole subject was discussed in all its bearings, by the ablest statesmen of England. The debates fill nearly one hundred and fifty pages, double-columned and closer than the pages of the *New Englander*. We have examined them carefully, pen in hand, and have transcribed from these volumes what we now present to our readers, which will afford the means of understanding the views with which the new system was adopted, and the rule by which the success is to be tested.

The subject was alluded to from time to time, during the session of 1839, in both Houses of Parliament, in connection with the presentation of some of the numerous petitions that poured in from the people.

The Duke of Richmond, June 3, 1839, in presenting petitions from a great many places in favor of a uniform rate of penny postage, expressed his dissent from the measure proposed by the committee, of 2d. as the uniform rate of postage. He

said that unless they adopted Mr. Hill's plan of 1d. they would not be able to prevent the illegal conveyance of letters. The only way they could hope to prevent that would be by taking the postage at the lowest rate, namely, a penny. He thought the principle should be adopted to encourage letter writing, and therefore they should allow every man to write, and send a letter without a stamp, if he pleased, but that all such letters should be charged, on delivery, at a higher rate. He saw no reason why the treasury should not purchase the stamps as well as other persons, and then it would be known what the amount of the money would come to in this way, and thereby the whole of the abuse of official franks would be got rid of. He would also throw out the propriety of allowing persons who purchased stamps, to send their letters by any coach, carrier, or steam-boat that might choose to take them, because, so long as the revenue was secured, parties ought to have their own option as to the mode of conveyance.—*Parl. Deb.*, xlvii, pp. 1231, 2.

But the regular debate was opened on the 5th of July, 1839, by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Francis Baring, in connection with the "opening of the Budget," or exhibition of the financial condition and plans of the government. The Chancellor of the Exchequer showed that there was a deficiency in the revenue to meet the wants of the year, of no less than one million, and then explains his plan of postage reduction, which contained in it a pledge of Parliament to make good the deficiency which *it was expected* would be caused in the revenue.

"Sir," said he, "if my proposition were one to reduce the postage on letters to one uniform rate of a penny, without making good the deficiency of revenue which might ensue, I should expose myself not only to the censure of the House and of the public, but to the ridicule and

soom of men of sense."—Vol. xlviii, p. 1358.

"The purport of the resolution is this: That it is expedient to reduce the postage on letters to one uniform rate of one penny, chargeable on every letter of a weight to be hereafter fixed by law, the parliamentary privilege of franking being abolished, and the official franking being placed under strict regulations: this House pledging itself, at the same time, to make good any deficiency of revenue which may be occasioned by such alteration in the rate of postage."

"If the committee will not pledge itself to make good the deficiency, I shall abandon the bill altogether. And should any honorable gentleman on either side of the House, undertake the management of the question under such circumstances, he will find me as steadfastly opposed to the measure, without this pledge, as the House will find me a steadfast, earnest and eager friend of the measure, if I am given the means of carrying it into effect in the only way in which it can be honestly carried out."—p. 1359.

"It would be clearly impossible for any person who reasons justly, or who properly considers his political duties, to say that we are entitled to put at risk a million and a half of the revenue of the country, without at the same time binding ourselves to make good any deficiency which may arise."—p. 1360.

"The Committee may expect me to state what amount of loss may be likely to arise from this change. I shall not go into much detail on this point, because it must be at the best mere matter of conjecture, and not at all open to demonstration. Gentlemen may assume that this or that amount of correspondence will be created, but I believe the ingenuity of no man can predict with any degree of closeness, what the future increase of letters will be. I am bound to say, that my own anticipation is, that *at the outset the loss will be very considerable indeed*. I am of course anxious that this resolution shall be carried, but I can not disguise from the House or the public, the fact, that in my opinion, the loss will be very great. I am the more bound to disclose this opinion, because, if I did not now avow it, and if hereafter the loss does turn out to be considerable, and the House and the public should therefore be called upon to pay an equivalent to supply this deficiency, the House might say that I had given them no warning, that I had deluded them into a vote, and had paltered with the truth."—p. 1364.

He then proceeded to call attention to the considerations by which the measure itself was urged upon their adoption, the report of the

Committee, and the petitions of the people, and showed the grounds on which he had departed from the recommendations of the Committee, in adopting a penny instead of a two penny rate. He said:—

"In the course of last year, a committee was moved for, and acquiesced in by me on the part of the government, to consider the subject of postage. Of that committee I may justly observe, that there are points on which I differ from their report, and on which indeed, let me add, they differ from themselves—but yet I must admit, that a committee which took more pains to inform itself, whose collection of evidence is more valuable, as giving the opinions of many of the most intelligent persons of all classes in the country, I never remember in my parliamentary experience. They sat for many days, they examined a great variety of persons, and though the proposition I have to make differs from that which they have suggested, I fully believe they would have sanctioned it. They made a recommendation to the House, not for the adoption of a uniform penny postage, but for a general two-penny postage, to be collected under certain regulations, and they considered that this two pence postage could be introduced without any loss to the revenue. Now, sir, from the best consideration which I have been able to give to the subject, comparing one proposition with the other, and, above all, considering the evidence taken before the committee, I find the whole of the evidence, *the whole of the authorities conclusively bearing in favor of a penny postage in preference to a two penny postage*. And, sir, I am quite sure that in making an experiment of this nature, it behoves this House to set to work, not only fairly and frankly, but largely, in order to come to a satisfactory result. And further, I conscientiously believe that *THE PUBLIC RUN LESS RISK OF LOSS IN ADOPTING THE PROPOSITION FOR A PENNY POSTAGE, THAN IT WOULD IF WE INTRODUCED A TWO-PENNY POSTAGE*."—p. 1360.

The judgment and will of the public at large is then adverted to, as evinced by the infinite number of petitions presented on this subject, from all classes and from all parts of the country. He says:

"I find that the mass of them present the most extraordinary combination I ever saw, of representations to one purpose from all classes, unawed by any political motives whatever; from persons of all shades of opinion, political and reli-

gious, from clergymen of the Established Church, from all classes of Protestant dissenters, from the clergymen of Scotland, from the commercial and trading communities in all parts of the kingdom."—p. 1361.

He supports that part of his plan which abolishes the parliamentary franking privilege, thus :

"Undoubtedly, we may lose the opportunity now and then, of obliging a friend; but on other grounds, I believe there is no member of the House who will not be ready to abandon the privilege. As to any notion that honorable gentlemen should retain their privilege under a penny postage, they must have a more intense appreciation of the value of money, and a greater disregard for the value of time, than I can conceive, if they insist on it. As to official franking, my idea is, that with some few exceptions, which may be considered hereafter, the business of the various departments ought to be conducted on the principle that *each shall pay its own postage*. I am aware that it may be said, this will practically amount to taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another; but I think it will tend greatly to diminish the amount of postage paid in these offices, if each is called upon to include that postage in its own contingencies."—p. 1365.

Can there be any doubt that, when this same question shall be fairly up and understood, equal magnanimity will be found among American legislators?

Mr. Goulburn, [then a leader of the opposition,] dissented entirely from the financial views of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He thought it irregular to propose a measure involving a reduction of revenue, without at the same time proposing a method to make good that deficiency. He would tell the right honorable gentleman what would be the result. At the end of the session, he would put his machinery in motion; letters would pay the penny postage, and at the end of the year, there would be a deficiency of from £500,000 to £1,000,000, which Parliament would be called upon to supply.—p. 1374.

But on the subject of the postage itself, and the system that ought to be adopted, he concurred very much

with what had been said. He admitted, with the right honorable gentleman, that under the circumstances, the placing in hazard a revenue of £1,500,000 was no trifling consideration. Though it was connected with the prospect of ultimately *increasing the wealth and prosperity of the country*, yet this was a certain revenue, free from doubt and fluctuation, and yielded an annual sum of £1,500,000. If the right honorable gentleman had had the surplus revenue which he recommended, he should have concurred in the propriety of an immediate change in this department, and after reading the report which the committee had made to the House, he would be disposed to say, if the experiment be made at all, *it would be wise to make it to the extent* which the right honorable gentleman proposed, and not to adopt the suggestion of the committee. After reading the evidence, he admitted that it was with no little surprise he found the committee proposing a postage of two pence instead of one penny; for the whole evidence went to show, that a postage of two pence would fail, but a penny might succeed. He would not say, after all that had been stated in the evidence, that the public would be disappointed in its expectations; but he felt assured that *there was a better chance of success by the one penny postage*, than by adopting the report of the committee."—p. 1373.

This was a voice from what was then the opposition side of the House. Other gentlemen expressed a more sanguine belief that the proposed reduction of postage would not be attended with a loss of revenue.

Mr. Hume said, there was no instance in which postage had been reduced, in which there had not been an increase of postage. When, too, he saw that from 15,000 to 20,000 letters were sent every day by members of both houses of parliament, he was sure that such let-

ters being charged in future, must help much to make up the deficiency which was expected to take place. He calculated that there would be a deficiency the first year; he believed there would be a deficiency the second year; but when the system came fairly into operation, towards the end of the second year, he did not believe the deficiency would be greater than what Mr. Hill had estimated it at, [£300,000 to £500,000.]—p. 1376.

Mr. Wallace, who was chairman of the committee on postage, declared that his conviction was, that although there might be a defalcation to the amount of £500,000 or £600,000 in the first year, including the expense of setting the machinery going, still he believed, that from the increase in the number of letters, and the universal use of the Post Office instead of its abuse, the revenue in the course of another year would be equal to its present amount. It was his confident anticipation and hope, that in three years the defalcation of the first year would be made up.—p. 1384.

He submitted that as England had the honor of this invention, which had undoubtedly been first brought before the public by Mr. Hill, that it would be exceedingly blameworthy in this country, for the sake of a loss of £500,000, which would be paid back in two or three years, if they were to lose the honor of being the first to execute a plan which was essentially necessary to the comforts of the human race.—p. 1384.

He calls it one of the greatest boons that could be conferred on the human race; and adverted to the progress of the question since it had been brought before the public. It was not till the commencement of the last year, [1838,] that Mr. Hill's plan became known to the country. From the first, he saw that it was a proposal that deserved the utmost consideration, and he was convinced that inquiry would prove its worth.

What was the effect produced? In 1838, there were 320 petitions presented in favor of the measure, many of them from large towns and from chambers of commerce. In the present session, not less than 1,800 petitions had been presented, showing an increase of more than five-fold. This was one proof of the interest taken by the public in this matter, but there was another proof. The first report of the select committee was published about Easter, and in less than two months that report was out of print, and no copies were now to be had to supply the wants of those foreign countries who were desirous of availing themselves of its contents. This showed the anxiety of the public on the subject.—p. 1387.

When a great commercial capital like London came forward, as it had done by constituting a postage committee, to endeavor to stir up the feelings of their countrymen in the remotest parts of the kingdom, it was no wonder that the sympathies of the whole nation were brought out to ask this boon.—p. 1388.

He begged permission to express his warm approbation of the plan of Mr. Hill, and to state that Mr. Hill was a man of a most honest and generous mind; that his sole object was to investigate the truth, and that for his indefatigable labors in bringing the intrinsic merits of his plan before the public, he was entitled to the lasting and grateful thanks of his country.—p. 1387.

Sir Robert Peel, then in the opposition, objected strongly to the financial plans, and especially to the proposed pledge, for its indefiniteness, &c. On the postage question, he was cautious in his expressions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the highest authorities of the country were in favor of this plan. But Sir Robert thought that a more decided condemnation of the plan he had never heard, than that which had been given by the Secre-

tary of the Post-office. Whether that opinion was well or ill founded he would not say, but this was the evidence of Colonel Maberly, the Secretary of the Post-office :—

“ He considered the whole scheme of Mr. Hill as utterly fallacious; he thought so from the first moment he read the pamphlet of Mr. Hill; and his opinion of the plan was formed long before the evidence was given before the committee. The plan appeared to him a most preposterous one, utterly unsupported by facts, and resting entirely on assumption. Every experiment in the way of reduction of postage which had been made by the post-office, had shown its fallacy; for every reduction whatever led to a loss of revenue in the first instance. If the reduction be small, the revenue recovers itself; but if the rates are to be reduced to 1d., the revenue would not recover itself for forty or fifty years.”

He begged it should be distinctly understood, that he did not wish to say one word in disparagement of the plan of Mr. Hill. [The Chancellor of the Exchequer, hear.] He understood what that cheer meant from the right honorable gentleman—to infer that he was deterred from expressing an opinion against the plan by a fear of forfeiting popularity. The reason was, that he did not feel himself called upon to enter upon details. If he wanted popularity, he would at once give way to the feeling in favor of the moral and social advantages which had already been alluded to, the great stimulus it would afford to the industry and commercial enterprise of the nation, and the boon it was described as presenting to the lower classes.—p. 1394.

Mr. Warburton referred to the fact that for twenty years the post-office revenue had continued stationary, and said the time was surely come for making a reform in the groundwork of this decayed branch of the public establishments. The tax on the transmission of each letter was as high as 1,000 or 1,400 per cent.; the actual cost was about  $\frac{1}{2}$ d., and the charge on an average was  $7\frac{1}{2}$ d. on single letters. He

would now read the opinion of a merchant—a gentleman extensively engaged in mercantile pursuits—who had given to the public works of great importance and utility, and which had received just attention and admiration. He alluded to the evidence given before the select committee by Mr. Cobden, of Manchester, on the question, what he thought of the manner in which the post-office was conducted :

“ That it is a total failure as a great commercial establishment—if I might so term it—is proved unquestionably to the whole community, by the fact of its being stationary in the amount of its profits and returns; we consider that the mode of conducting it has proved it to be a failure—commercially speaking—the greatest failure in the country.”—p. 1398.

He explained the report of the select committee. It was true they had reported in favor of a uniform rate of two pence, but it was proper to state that they had done so only on the principle that a uniform rate of two pence was better than no uniform rate at all. He had at first proposed to the committee to recommend a uniform rate of one penny, and he had acquiesced in the report, upon the ground that the facts and arguments would be equally and indeed more applicable to a lower rate.—p. 1400.

He maintained that twelve months would not be a fair trial of the plan. Look at the advertisement duty. It was reduced from 3s. 6d. to 1s. 6d., having been retrograding for three years previously; yet the revenue arising from the advertisement duty was now 75 per cent. of what it was before the reduction, and was advancing at the rate of 8 per cent. per annum; so that in three years from the time of making the reduction, the revenue would amount to as much as before.—p. 1403.

Mr. O'Connell heartily supported the reduction, in both its branches. That part of it which altered the postage to a penny on each letter, he thought would be one of the most

*valuable legislative reliefs that had ever been given to the people of this country since he had a seat in Parliament.* It was impossible to exaggerate its importance. It would be of immense importance to his own countrymen. All parties in Ireland were agreed upon the propriety and necessity of it.—p. 1408.

Could any man consider the question, and not agree with him, that all the government should have required was to be indemnified against the expense of the post-office? Nay, if the postage on letters was not sufficient for that, government ought to make a sacrifice for the purpose of facilitating communication.—p. 1409.

He wished honorable members would look at the effect of railroads. Upon the only railroad in Ireland, a reduction of 1d. in 9d. had increased the number of passengers going by the carriages 27 per cent. in four months, and in that way of looking at it, in all probability in a very short time any immediate decrease would be fully made up. Who could estimate the immense increased quantity of letters that would be written in consequence of this reduction? He thought the probability was, that instead of the revenue being diminished, it would be considerably increased.—p. 1410.

The preliminary resolution was agreed to.

The subject came up again, on receiving the report of the committee, on the 12th of July. Mr. Goulburn made a strenuous effort to *put off* the adoption of the new system. He had heard that a noble lord, the Postmaster General, had, in another place, called the measure wild and visionary; and in the committee every member of the government had voted against the plan. Therefore he had no expectations that the House would be called upon during the present session, to give effect to the recommendations of the committee.—Vol. xlix, p. 278.

His view was, and in that respect he believed he and the right honorable gentleman, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, agreed, that the loss of revenue would be greater under a two-penny than under a uniform rate of one penny; and if such were the case, the House ought certainly to wait till the state of the public revenue would justify them in adopting the reduction to the greatest possible extent.—p. 283.

Whatever the result might be, he should have the proud satisfaction of knowing that he had given his counsel for the postponement of this measure, so as to give time for consideration.—p. 284.

How far the honorable gentleman now regards "with proud satisfaction" his effort to defeat by postponing that beneficent scheme, may well demand a doubt.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer was astonished at the modified shape in which the opposition was now brought forward, in a mere motion for postponement. He regarded this plan as a convenient way which honorable gentlemen opposite had chosen of telling the country, "We do not choose to hazard our popularity by opposing this measure." If this were merely an abstract question of any common tax, no one would doubt that it would be a public benefit. Repeal the tax on letters, and there was hardly one person, he might almost say, in the whole country, who would not experience a direct and personal benefit. This was not a question of intricacy—it was not one requiring calculation or analysis to understand it. It was a question of simple demonstration, that persons now unable to write would feel an interest and excitement in writing, when the postage of letters is lower, and that the benefit by the poorer classes would at once be felt.—p. 286.

He declared that he had brought the business honestly and fairly before the House—he had never dis-

guised from the House that the real question at issue was not the remission of the duty on the postage of letters, but the imposition of a tax to the amount which they proposed to lose—he had always maintained that it would be attended with an enormous sacrifice of the public money; and unless the House was prepared to make good the amount, he was not prepared, and he hoped no majority of the House ever would be prepared to sanction its adoption.—p. 287.

He declared it was the duty of the House to guarantee the public creditor against the loss of that portion of his security. And when those honorable gentlemen maintained, that the guarantee which he asked was valueless on the one hand, because it never would be necessary to enforce it, and refused on the other hand to give that guarantee, useless and inoperative according to their views, he asked the House if they did not put in peril the very proposition which they thus somewhat inconsistently maintained.—p. 288.

He then showed that Mr. Goulburn had made the danger greater than it really was, in assuming that the *whole* of the revenue drawn from postage would be lost. From 1834 to 1838, there had been reductions in several branches of postage. In 1834, the gross income of the post-office was £2,209,439, and in 1838 it was £2,438,000, and it would be found that the increase had been in those departments in which the greatest reductions had been made in the rates of postage. This, he said, supported the argument of those who looked to the *elasticity of the post-office revenue* to enable them to make up any deficiency that might at first occur. He compared the ship and foreign letters for a limited period of 1833, and a like period of 1838, and found that the receipts for the first period were £88,000, and for the last,

£103,000, being the largest proportionate increase with the largest proportionate reduction of postage. He found that the number of ship letters sent respectively, in a short period of the years 1833 and 1837, were 47,000 and 167,000. This was an augmentation of about four-fold in the correspondence.—p. 288.

Sir Robert Peel said the great objection to the reduction was, that with a deficiency of revenue amounting to nearly a million, they were about to incur the hazard of a further loss to the amount of a million and a half. He wished to know if the government were about to adopt the principle of repealing every tax that became obnoxious, on a mere parliamentary pledge to make good the deficiency. This was just the course which was pursued by the National Assembly of France. He inquired why the same rule was not applied to other taxes that were burdensome. Had they heard nothing about the window tax? Had nothing been said about the repeal of the duty on soap? Would not the cause of morality and cleanliness be advanced if the soap tax were repealed, and parliament were to pledge itself to supply the deficiency that might be thereby occasioned? Surely, if the principle was a just one, it ought to be applied in all cases.—p. 294.

Mr. Poulett Thompson said that all the government wanted was, an opportunity of trying the effects of the measure, and afterwards when they saw their way more clearly than they did at present, of digesting a plan to be laid before parliament. The question in reference to a deficiency no man could ascertain, for it was beyond the power of calculation. On this subject, all the witnesses examined before the committee differed. One stated that there would be no deficiency; another said it would be small; while Lord Ashburton declared that it would amount to the sacrifice of the

whole revenue of the post-office. What then should be the estimate of the deficiency? He saw no other rational course but that which had been proposed.—p. 300.

Mr. Warburton complained of the manner in which the question had been treated. Nobody had spoken of postage, except as a part of the revenue. He denied that it had ever, from the first statute creating a post-office down to the last report, been treated as a *mere* matter of revenue. The original act by which the post-office was created, the act of Charles 2d, stated that the post-office was established, not as a branch of the revenue, but *for the advantage of trade and commerce*. The public was therefore in the right in the view which they took of this matter—namely, that the primary object of its institution was to contribute to their convenience. The advantage of post-office communications ought to be accessible to the whole community; and the subject was, in fact, one which ought not to be made matter of taxation at all.—p. 302.

Viscount Sandon, a conservative, thought it necessary to explain the vote he intended to give in favor of the motion. He had long been of opinion that the post-office was not a proper source of revenue; it ought, in his opinion, to be employed in *stimulating other sources of revenue*. He had expressed these opinions in other places; they were not the result of pressure from without, but were the sincere feelings of his own mind.—p. 304. The vote for the bill was, 215 to 113.

July 22, the bill came up on the second reading. Mr. Goulburn complained of the boundless discretion given to the Treasury by the bill. Sir R. H. Inglis shared in the same opinion. He also denounced the scheme, as a plan in itself for the benefit of the great traders. He thought it was introduced partly on political grounds, to gain popularity,

but mainly for the purpose of benefiting great mercantile houses. Before the franking privilege was limited, they had heard it was worth to a mercantile house from £300 to £800 a year; at present it could not be worth less than £300. The great advantage, therefore, which his plan held out to mercantile houses, was the cause of the numerous petitions which had emanated from them, and of the meeting at the Mansion House two or three weeks ago. He would therefore resist this bill.—p. 626.

He adverted to the abolition of the franking privilege, and said he did not see why, because a tax was to be taken off others, a tax was to be imposed on members. It would be, to those who had much correspondence, at least £15 a year, at the reduced rate of a penny a letter. To the revenue the saving to be obtained was so small, that he hoped the House would not consent to rescind that privilege.—p. 627.

On the true measure of postage he said, the real question before the House was not, whether the government could send the letters of the community from London to Edinburgh for one-twelfth of a penny each, and therefore ought not to charge a shilling, but what it would cost each individual to forward his own letters, if no such thing as a post-office existed.—p. 627.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said the sacrifice of the franking privilege would be small in amount, but at the same time, be it small or great, he thought there would be not one feature in the new system which would be more palatable to the public, than this practical evidence of the willingness of members of this House, to sacrifice every thing personal to themselves for the advantage of the public revenue.—p. 634.

Sir Robert Peel did not think it desirable that members of this House should retain their privilege of franking. He thought if this were to be continued after this bill came into

operation, there would be a degree of odium attached to it, which would greatly diminish its value. He agreed that it would be well to restrict in some way the right of sending by mail the heavy volumes of reports; and said there were many members who would shrink from the exercise of such a privilege, to load the mail with books. He would also require, that each department should specially pay the postage incurred for the public service in that department. If every office be called upon to pay its own postage, we shall introduce a useful principle into the public service. *There is no habit connected with a public office so inveterate, as the privilege of official franking.*

—p. 635.

I stated on a former night, that having deliberately protested against this measure, I should not think it necessary to meet its further progress with any vexatious opposition.—p. 636.

I do not deny that *great social and commercial advantages will arise* from the change, independent of financial considerations. Even if the scheme had not been proposed, I think the evidence laid before the committee would warrant a considerable reduction in postage. I think we should have made the experiment of a partial reduction. It has been said that the principal advantage of the measure will be felt by the commercial interests. If so, it will be a greater recommendation to me, for *wherever commercial interest is facilitated*, the result must be the general benefit of the country.—p. 639.

Opposition being thus abandoned, the bill was read a third time and passed, on the 29th of July, and had its first reading in the House of Lords on the same day.

*August 5th*, Viscount Melbourne moved the second reading of the bill. He said it was not necessary to point out how great would be the advantages, commercial and social,

that would result from this change. There was another matter which was made manifest in the evidence, as the result of the high charge for postage—*the extraordinary contraband conveyance of letters*. It had become necessary to make reductions in the rates of postage to the extent contemplated in the bill, in order to protect both the revenue and the morals of the people. For it must be recollect, if only a small reduction were made, it would not effect the object in view; for while the modes of evasion had been organized and put into play, so that they might be resorted to with ease, it had become almost a habit, and persons for the sake of small profit, would be induced to follow the contraband trade of conveying letters; and above all, when it was the most easy matter in the world to pursue it. He would therefore say that, so far as this plan was for the general benefit, and also for the purpose of collecting the revenue, *the reduction should be made to such an extent as to ensure the object of stopping the contraband trade.*—p. 1208.

The Duke of Wellington had never addressed their lordships with more pain and anxiety than at present. He admitted the force of the argument urged by the noble Viscount as to the expediency, and indeed the necessity of establishing a uniform and low rate of postage. He admitted the great inconveniences that resulted from the present high rates of postage, tending, as they did, to the contraband conveyance of letters. He was disposed to admit that that which was called Mr. Rowland Hill's plan, was, if it was carried out exactly as was proposed, *of all the plans, that which was most likely to be successful*. But he felt there was a great mistake in supposing that the reduced price of postage to one penny, to be paid on the delivery of the letter, would induce a great deal of literary correspondence. For some years he

had had some knowledge of the advantage and operation of such a system in the army, and he could safely assure their lordships that it was quite curious to observe the very small quantity of correspondence carried on by soldiers, notwithstanding they had the utmost facilities afforded them for correspondence at a penny a letter. Here, he contended, was a fact which showed that the people of this country would not be so ready to correspond, if they had a cheap postage.—p. 1216.

He then went into an examination of the finances, found much fault with the proposed method of meeting the financial difficulty, and closed by declaring that, as the reform of the post-office, which it is the object of this bill to effect, and which is desired should be carried into execution, must altogether lie over, unless you agree to some such measure as this, I shall, although with great reluctance, vote for the bill, and I earnestly recommend you to do likewise.—p. 1221.

The Earl of Ripon could not see where in the world they could get any more taxes, to supply the deficiency of the revenue which this would create, though he quite concurred in thinking that the post-office revenue ought not to be raised with a mere view to revenue, but they had got involved in a different policy, and might embarrass the government by trying to get out of it in too hasty a manner.—p. 1227.

Lord Brougham commended the candor of Lord Melbourne's statements; he had more confidence in the noble Viscount when he saw him take that calm, rational, deliberate view of the question, and it would give the country more confidence.—p. 1228. The noble Duke had said that extravagant calculations were made of the increase of the number of letters to be sent by post, and he gave a remarkable instance, which was, of course, quite certain, that a regiment of a thousand men, in six

months, only sent sixty-five letters by post. He had heard of similar facts, but he had two answers in point. In the first place, soldiers, if he might use the expression with all possible respect for the military character, were not letter-writing animals. They were not naturally writers of letters. They fought, paraded and obeyed orders very naturally; habit had made it second nature: but they were not in the constant habit of taking up a pen and getting a sheet of paper and writing a letter. They did not correspond upon military subjects; it was not always permitted, and indeed they did not correspond much upon any subjects, except indeed upon amatory subjects, and those not so much with persons at a distance, as by word of mouth. But this argument proved too much—it proved that this regiment wrote no letters at all; only one man in twenty-five ever wrote, and the rest could not write at all, more than if they were horses.—p. 1229. Another answer was the fact, that in February, 1838, the number of military letters that went through the General Post-office in London was 2,410, whilst the total number of letters was 188,000; so that one-eightieth of the whole number of letters were written by soldiers, who were not naturally letter-writers, but who were tempted to correspond by the extremely low rate of postage, [1d. for soldiers' letters.]—p. 1230.

He adduced some facts as to the effect of low prices. In Dublin a reduction made in the postage, from two pence to a penny, was calculated to create a loss of £20,000 in £100,000; but so far from that, it had produced a gain or £10,000 in £100,000. A similar reduction in Edinburgh to a penny rate, had caused no loss, and was at present beginning to produce an increase. In fact, people did not care about a penny rate. The Penny Magazine, with which he is common with me-

ny of their lordships was connected, sold in one week 220,000 ; but he had no doubt that if raised one half-penny in price, the sale would fall off one half. An instance of the kind took place in the sale of the *Spectator*, Addison's paper, to which the addition of half-penny in price caused an immense fall in the circulation. He had no doubt the same rule would apply to the reduction proposed in the bill before their lordships, and that here as in most cases relating to revenue, the lowering of the tax would increase the income.—p. 1231.

Lord Ashburton thought the instances cited by his noble friend of reduction in the revenue were not analogous, the reduction being in the present case of an extraordinary nature. He expected the cost of the department, under the new system, would amount to a million of money. This amount must be made up out of several pence before they could touch one farthing of the present income of £1,600,000. He could not help thinking it altogether a matter of much uncertainty. There could be no doubt that the country at large would derive an immense benefit ; the consumption of paper would be increased considerably ; it appeared by all the evidence *most probable that the number of letters would be at least doubled*.—p. 1232.

It appeared to him that a tax upon communication between distant parties, was of all taxes the most objectionable. He referred to the condition of emigrants in Canada, and of the poor at home, and to the benefits of communication in all the branches of commerce. If men engaged in business were precluded from that free discussion which was necessary to the successful transaction of their affairs, business must become crippled and contracted, and many excellent speculations must lie dormant, in consequence of insufficient information.—p. 1233. At one time he was of opinion that the

uniform charge of postage should be 2d. ; but he found the mass of evidence so strongly in favor of 1d., that he concluded her Majesty's ministers were right in coming down to the uniform rate of 1d.—p. 1234.

The Earl of Lichfield, Postmaster General, said that the leading idea of Mr. Rowland Hill's bill seemed to be the fancy that he had hit a scheme for recovering the £2,000,000, which he thought the post-office had lost by the high rates of postage. His own opinion was, that the recovery of that revenue *was totally impossible*, and that by the proposed reduction, a considerable loss to the revenue would accrue. He, therefore, supported the present measure on entirely different grounds from those on which Mr. Hill proposed it. He assented to the bill on the grounds on which it had been proposed by his noble friend—on the grounds on which it had been proposed in the House of Commons. *In neither house had it been brought forward on the ground that the revenue would be the guinea, or that, under it, the revenue would be equal to that now derived from the post-office department.* HE ASSENTED TO IT ON THE SIMPLE GROUND THAT THE DEMAND FOR IT WAS UNIVERSAL, after three years' consideration—after public meetings, at which the matter had been fully discussed, and the voluminous evidence which showed a material loss to the revenue from the change, had been published, petitions from all parts of the country crowded the tables of both houses of Parliament, and the people, through their representatives, were strong in their expressions in its favor ; and therefore he was entitled to come, with his noble friend, to the conclusion that it was highly expedient that this measure should pass into a law. So obnoxious was the tax on letters, that the people had declared their readiness to submit to any impost that might be substituted in its stead ; and on

*these principles he agreed to the plan, assuring the House that he would use his best exertions in carrying it out.*—p. 1238.

With this, the debate closed, and the bill passed. The results, the benefits to the country, the vast increase of correspondence, the friendships cultivated, the social affections gratified, the great advantages im-

parted to trade, the aid given to every movement of philanthropy, the power it has conferred on the people to control the government, the stability it has given to the government by its new hold upon the affections of the people, are topics of reflection on which our limits forbid us to expatiate at this time.

#### UPHAM'S LIFE OF MADAM GUYON.\*

THE age of Louis XIV. is marked by two apparently inconsistent facts—the unusual prevalence of persecution by the authorities of the Romish church in France, and the unusual manifestation of piety among its members. Whether it was the extension to another scene of the powerful work of the Spirit which was then going forward in Great Britain, whether it was owing to the reaction of the persecutions producing awe and solemnity in many minds, or whatever is the explanation, the fact is indisputable. We need name only Pascal and Fenelon. But the minute examination of the history of that period shows a great number who trusted with more or less distinctness in a crucified Savior, and led lives of sincere and humble piety. The piety, however, which prevailed among individuals was a foil to set off those anti-christian elements, which are incorporated into the Romish church. For, while the church was persecuting the Huguenots, it spared not pious persons within its own communion; it sent

Fenelon into banishment from his high position at the palace, and persecuted poor washerwomen for presuming to pray in their own houses, in any words not prescribed in the liturgy. And yet not all were persecuted. Many private persons, whom circumstances did not bring into collision with the ecclesiastics, were allowed to enjoy their piety in peace; while Fenelon was banished, the Duke de Beauvilliers, holding the same sentiments and imbued with a similar piety, was retained in office; while Michael de Molinos and Father La Combe were worn out in prisons, Francis de Sales, who taught the same doctrine, was but a little while before (1665) canonized.

To those who are accustomed to think that the corruptions of the Romish church must adhere to every individual in its communion, it may seem strange to talk about piety among Romanists in any age. If to be a member of that church is necessarily to be an idolater, to be ignorant of the truths of the Bible, to lean on the priest for pardon, to trust to penances and human works, then it is indeed impossible to be a Roman Catholic and, at the same time, a Christian. But history shows it is not so. We thank God that we are not compelled to believe that the vast portion of the history of Christendom occupied by the Catbo-

\* Life and religious opinions and experience of Madam de la Mothe Guyon; together with some account of the personal history and religious opinions of Fenelon, Archbishop of Cambry. By Thomas C. Upham, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Bowdoin College. In two vols. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1847.

lic church is one unbroken scene of spiritual death. As we explore minutely this monstrous carcass of rottenness, we are thankful to find not a few cells of the honey-comb. In truth, piety, planted and cultivated by the Holy Spirit, will find a soil in the human heart from which it may grow under whatever obstacles. And it is not strange if we find instances of it amid all the crushing errors and mouldering rites which that old church has piled upon it, struggling up like saplings amid rocks and old crumbling trunks. And though sometimes bent into strange shapes, or bearing disagreeable fungous excrescences, or dwarfed to an exceeding littleness, yet we rejoice to find the living plant of righteousness, the same in kind as when, under more favorable circumstances, it flourishes in the beauty and stateliness of the cedar of Lebanon. And it is an interesting study to observe in what various, and sometimes even fantastic forms, true grace, under such obstacles, has developed itself.

Madam Guyon was one of the more noted among the pious Catholics belonging to the age of which we speak. Her life is worthy of examination, not only for the intrinsic interest of her experience, but because her history is interwoven with that of some of the most prominent characters and events of those times, and is an exponent of Quietism, that peculiar development of the religious principle, which then elicited so much attention. The biographer exhibits much research in order to throw light on his subject. Not confining himself to Madam G., he has given us much information about Fenelon and other persons and events connected with the history of the Quietists, and has produced a work suited to interest intensely, and to profit all who have discrimination enough to "separate the precious from the vile." We suggest, however, that the bio-

grapher might advantageously have spared a part of his own reflections. He has also deemed it necessary to give what he calls an "interpreted translation" of Madam Guyon's language. Consequently, though no one, who knows Prof. Upham's singleness of heart, will for a moment doubt that he has exhibited what he regarded as her precise meaning, yet we can not help wishing sometimes for her precise words, that we may judge of her meaning for ourselves; nor can we rid ourselves of the impression that we are reading the work of her advocate, rather than of her unbiased biographer. There is, however, an important reason for this unusual course. Madam Guyon is generally known among us, if at all, only as an arrant fanatic. The most common notices of her which we have seen in Biographical Dictionaries, mention in a few lines some of her most offensive expressions and dismiss her with marked contempt. Protestants, contrary to their wont, have sympathized in their views of her with the Romish persecutors. This is in part owing to herself. She used language with great lack of precision. Hence she has used expressions easily misunderstood, from which the most extravagant sentiments have been charged on her. Many of these expressions she elsewhere modified and explained. For example, she has been ridiculed for believing herself to be the woman spoken of in Rev. 12, 1-6; but in her examination by Bossuet, she declared that she referred to that passage not as prophetic of her, but only as illustrative of her own case in being driven from place to place. Hence a necessity arises of comparing her writings in order to ascertain her meaning. This Dr. Upham has diligently done. The result is that no one can rise from reading the book, we think, without a conviction, for which he will feel that the biographer has

given solid reasons, that, though she was imaginative in the extreme, though she held some errors, and her life was tinged throughout with enthusiasm, yet she was far better than the ridiculous fanatic which she has extensively been supposed to be ; that she was a woman of brilliant intellect, of commanding influence, and of remarkable attainments in the divine life.

She was born at Montargis in 1648. She was exceedingly beautiful, and was distinguished from childhood for strong devotional tendencies. When not over six years old, she avowed her readiness to become a martyr. Her young associates then undertook to make her believe that God had suddenly, but really, called her to that fate. Her firmness continued till, having offered her private supplications, she knelt on the cloth prepared to receive her blood and the executioner lifted over her the cutlass. Then, overcome by her fears, she cried, that she was not at liberty to die without leave from her father. This is a characteristic incident, exhibiting her strong religious susceptibility, and her facility in believing remarkable things of herself, which characterized her whole life. At the age of ten she found a Bible, providentially left in her room, contrary to the custom of the place, at the Dominican convent, in which she was a pupil. At once she became an eager student of it. "I spent whole days," she says, "in reading it; giving no attention to other books or other subjects from morning to night. I committed to memory the historical parts entirely." She continued the study of the Bible from this time through life, writing in after years extensive commentaries. At sixteen she married M. Guyon, a man of great wealth. The connection proved unhappy through the persecutions of her husband's mother. These afflictions revived Madam Guyon's

religious feelings which had been somewhat dissipated, previous to her marriage, by the gay society of Paris. Devout as she had been, she had sought God's favor by her own works, as is usual with Catholics. It was not till four years after her marriage that she apprehended experimentally the great doctrine of justification by faith. A pious Franciscan pointed out her error in these words ; "Your efforts have been unsuccessful, because you have sought without, what you can only find within. Accustom yourself to seek God in your own heart and you will not fail to find him." Immediately the truth flashed on her mind ; she saw the folly of leaning on outward works and the propriety of looking directly to him who loves to dwell in the hearts of returning prodigals. Her soul filled with the love of God, she exclaims, "Oh beauty, ancient and new ! why have I known thee so late ? Alas, I sought thee where thou wast not, and did not seek thee where thou wast. It was for want of understanding these words of thy gospel : 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say, Lo ! here, nor lo ! there ; for the kingdom of God is within you.' I slept not all that night, because thy love, oh my God, flowed in me like delicious oil, and burned as a fire which was going to destroy all that was left of self in an instant. I was all on a sudden so altered, that I was hardly to be known either by myself or others. I found no more those troublesome faults or that reluctance to duty, which formerly characterized me. They all disappeared, as being consumed like chaff in a great fire." In the enjoyment of this love she continued with considerable uniformity, sometimes so absorbed in her own mental exercises as to be entirely unconscious of the conversation of the family, even when new and interesting events were related. Two

years later, after conversation with a mendicant, who joined her in the street, whom she never saw before or after, and who urged her to higher attainments in holiness, we find her fainting with excess of emotion in the church of Notre Dame, and immediately consecrating herself anew to be wholly the Lord's. This was an era in her life. Two years after she renewed this consecration and reduced it to writing as follows; "I henceforth take Jesus Christ to be mine, I promise to receive him as a husband to me. And I give myself to him, unworthy though I am, to be his spouse. I ask of him, in this marriage of spirit with spirit, that I may be of the same mind with him—meek, pure, nothing in myself, and united to God's will. And pledged as I am to be his, I accept as a part of my marriage portion, the temptations and sorrows, the crosses and contempt which fell to him." In this simple act of consecration, which expresses what was thence forward the controlling principle in her life, she speaks of her union with Christ as a marriage; this is the type of her habitual thoughts respecting it. The idea is prominent in the Scriptures and in itself is suitable and expressive. But Madam G. was wont to indulge in fondling expressions\* not consistent with good taste, and it may have been these which provoked her husband's jealous com-

plaint, "You love God so much that you love me no longer." Two years later commenced a state of spiritual "aridity" or desolation, during which, though she seems to have retained a will generally submissive to God, she was deprived of consolation. It continued more than six years. During this period of darkness and mental sorrow, she sought counsel of many but in vain. At last having gained from Father La Combe, who himself owed much of his spiritual growth, if not his first conversion to her instrumentality, more scriptural views of God's dealings with her, she was gradually encouraged and finally obtained complete deliverance. She seems now first to have apprehended that principle, on which the Quietists greatly insisted, that the evidence of piety does not consist in the strength of emotion, but in the submission of the will. Of the change now experienced she says; "What I had possessed some years before, in the period of my spiritual enjoyment, was consolation, peace—the gift of God rather than the Giver; but now I was brought into such harmony with the will of God, whether that will was consoling or otherwise, that I might be said to possess not merely consolation, but the God of consolation; not merely peace, but the God of peace. My intellect, free from those disturbing influences which originate

\* She was in the habit of styling God, Love, and occasionally used language savoring of the novel and the love-mong. One of her poems, translated by Cowper, begins thus:

"There's not an echo round me  
But I am glad should learn,  
How pure a fire has found me,—  
The love with which I burn." \*\*\*

"The rocks receive less proudly  
The story of my flame;  
When I approach they loudly  
Reverberate his name."

In another she speaks of Love so as to remind us, in spite of ourselves, of Cupid:—

" 'Twas my purpose, on a day,  
To embark and sail away;  
As I climbed the vessel's side,  
Love was sporting in the tide. \*\*\*  
Soon I saw him with dismay  
Spread his plumes and soar away."

"This was just what Love intended;  
He was now no more offended;  
Soon as I became a child,  
Love returned to me and smiled.  
Never strife shall more betide  
'Twixt the Bridegroom and the Bride."

A few of her poetical pieces, however, are beautiful, especially the one in Cowper's translations, beginning:

"Oh thou by long experience tried," &c.

is selfishness, was unperplexed and clear in its action. That heart, where I had formerly detected in their secret places so many evil motives, was now, so far as I was enabled to perceive, made pure. I did all sorts of good, as it were by a new and imperative law written in my heart; naturally, easily, without premeditation, as it was without selfishness. I no longer felt myself obliged to say, "When I would do good, evil is present with me." *Doing good was now my nature.* The principle of action did not seem to be from motives applied without; but rather to be involved in a life operative within. All was done in God and for God; and it was done quietly, freely, naturally, continually." It was now that she realized in her own experience, as she supposed, the annihilation of self, the state of nothingness—a state in which, according to the Quietists, the soul ceases from all selfish desire and action, and rests in a state of passivity, or, rather, "passively-active" in God's hand, desiring only what he desires and acting only as he acts in it. It was now she passed into a state of full uninterrupted peace, and, as she believed, of uniform and delighted conformity to the will and the image of God.

Her husband being now dead, she considered how she might most usefully employ herself. She thought of going as a missionary to Siam; for at this time there was much of the missionary spirit among the Catholics; Fenelon himself, at one time, seriously contemplated a mission to Canada. The circumstances of herself and family seemed to preclude this, and she finally decided that it was the will of the Lord that she should go to the remote parts of France. Rejecting, therefore, several advantageous offers of marriage, and leaving the circles of wealth and rank in which she had been accustomed to move, she re-

moved with her little daughter to Gex, twelve miles from Geneva. It has been charged upon her that she went forth believing "that heaven had destined her for an extraordinary mission." But her expectations must have been humble, if we may judge from the fact that on her arrival at Gex she employed herself in teaching the poor and relieving their wants—for, with her great wealth she always abounded in beneficence to the poor—and seriously contemplated employing herself in making ointments for wounds and ministering to the suffering—a mode of benevolence then common among Catholic women. But providence soon opened to her other employment. Her peculiar sentiments and her abundant peace in God could not fail to attract attention. Though she seems not to have taken pains to go abroad to propagate her sentiments—it being a principle with her; which she occasionally carried to excess, to do nothing except under the leadings of God's providence—yet many came to her for religious conversation, some to find out what this new doctrine was, others, sincere inquirers for salvation. She was blest as the instrument of leading some to find peace in Christ. But, as was to be expected, her sentiments awakened opposition which compelled her to leave the place. And the same was the history of her whole five years' wanderings. Those that were burdened in spirit came to her for counsel—for burdened ones there were in that old church, as Luther had been before. Many have been the children of that church that have come to her and asked for bread, and she has given them a stone or a scorpion; and awful will be the account she must give for the thousands of her sons and daughters, whose history never was written, whom crushed beneath the agonies of a burdened spirit, she has turned off with penances, and

rites, and "pattering prayer," instead of guiding them to Christ. Many such are brought to light in this biography, and others were awakened by Madam G.'s influence. And we find that whether at Gex, at Thonon, at Grenoble, or Dijon where she successively sojourned, there was developed an awakening to spiritual interests fitly designated as a revival of religion. She speaks of the interest at Grenoble thus: "People flocked together from all sides, far and near. Friars, priests, men of the world, maids, wives, widows all came, one after another, to hear what was to be said. So great was the interest felt, that for some time I was wholly occupied from six in the morning till eight in the evening, in speaking of God. He enabled me, in a wonderful manner, to understand the spiritual condition and wants of those who came to me, and to say to them something which was pertinent and satisfactory. Many were the souls which submitted to God at this time; God only knows how many. Some appeared to be changed, as it were in a moment. Delivered from a state in which their hearts and lips were closed, they were at once induced with gifts of prayer which were wonderful. Marvelous, indeed, was this work of the Lord."

Madam G., indeed, held some errors. But she held also the life-giving truths of God's word, which had long been overlooked in the Romish church. Is it strange that those truths, proclaimed by one who felt them, should prove, through the Spirit, the power of God unto salvation? As to any who will not own that God would do good by such an instrument, we may find a reply suggested in her answer to Bossuet, when he urged that a woman ought not to presume to write on theology; "In his great wisdom, God sometimes makes use of feeble instruments. And I have thought, as he condescended, on

one occasion, to employ a dumb animal to utter his truth, he might sometimes make use of a woman for the same purpose." Indeed we may regard Madam Guyon as an instance of spiritual power wielded, in spite of the most unfavorable circumstances, by those who are intimately united to Christ. The iron, while it cleaves to the magnet, and only then, is possessed of all the magnet's energies; and the soul, while it cleaves to Christ, and only then, is filled with spiritual power and electric with holy influence. Errors insufficient to prevent an extraordinary intimacy of union with Christ, are insufficient to prevent, though they may impair extraordinary spiritual power. And who-ever, like the Apostles, compels men to take knowledge of him, that he has been with Jesus, will, like the Apostles, do wondrous works.

Opposition attended Madam Guyon everywhere, and, being persecuted in one city she fled to another, until, in 1686, she returned to Paris. During her absence from Paris she prepared some of her religious works, and afterwards continued to write till her works amounted to many volumes. Her life in Paris was similar to what it had been during her five years residence in the provincial cities. Many sought her acquaintance for the purpose of religious conversation, among whom were some of high rank, including Madam de Maintenon, the wife of the king by a private marriage. Many seem to have been savingly benefited by her. As one instance we may refer to her labors among the two hundred and fifty young ladies of the Institution of St. Cyr, at which Madam de Maintenon, its foundress and patroness, frequently met Madam G., and permitted her to converse with the pupils. A general seriousness pervaded the seminary as the result, and many of the young ladies exhibited a reformation exceedingly gratifying to the

patroness of the school. But in Paris, also, her course awakened opposition. Bossuet himself thought it not beneath him to attempt to confute her, and the king took especial interest against her. Consequently she was imprisoned, once in a convent for eight months in 1688, and again Dec. 31, 1695, in the castle of Vincennes, whence she was removed after about nine months to a prison at Vaurigard, where she remained more than two years. She was then transferred to the Bastile, where she remained four years. After her release, with a constitution broken down by her sufferings, but with her soul at peace, she spent the remainder of her life in retirement. In 1717 she died, at the age of 69.

Such was the life of Madam G. Any mere sketch must necessarily be meager, of a life, the interest of which consists in the varied manifestations of Christian experience.

Between her first and second imprisonments commenced her intimacy with Fenelon, the account of which constitutes, perhaps, the most interesting part of the work. Dr. Upham has adduced apparently conclusive reasons for believing that Madam G. had an important influence in determining his religious sentiments, and in developing that beauty and elevation of piety which all the world has admired. He seems to have adopted her sentiments; although, possessed of a mind better balanced and disciplined, and more stored with learning, he used language less liable to be misunderstood. He was known as the friend of Madam G., and when Bossuet published his work, *Instructions on the states of prayer*, which was designed to controvert Madam Guyon's doctrines, Fenelon refused to assent to it, and affirmed—what he seems to have regarded as her real sentiments—his own belief on the controverted points, in his little work, *The maxims of the saints*. More

than two quarto volumes of the works of Bossuet and Fenelon are filled with the treatises which originated in this controversy. The result was that Fenelon was condemned by the Pope, and deprived by the king of the office of Preceptor at the palace and banished to his own diocese. It has commonly been supposed that he recanted. If he did, it is certain that he held the same sentiments till the close of life. His friends have attempted to justify him by saying that his submission was not a recantation, but only a *nolo contendere*, growing out of his views of the duty of submission to the head of the church. Prof. Upham presents a different defense, that the Pope condemned, not Fenelon's real sentiments, but explanations of those sentiments and inferences from them, which Fenelon himself repudiated—a condemnation to which, in justice to himself, he would not object. Bausset, his biographer, confirms this, saying, "The Pope had openly declared on many occasions, that neither he nor the cardinals had intended to condemn the explanations which the Archbishop of Cambray had given of his book."

Madam Guyon was a perfectionist. She believed that she lived in unvarying conformity to the divine will. Her views, however, of what sanctification is, appear to have been more nearly correct than those of many perfectionists. These views may be inferred from the following paragraphs. Speaking of some remarkable experience previous to her attaining entire conformity to God, she says: "This was the result of grace. Grace conquered nature; but it was nature in its *operations*, rather than in its *essence*. My will was subdued in its operations in particular cases, so that I could praise the Lord for entire *acquiescence*; but there still remained in it a *secret tendency*, when a fa-

verable opportunity should present, to break out of that harmony and put itself in revolt. I have since found, in the strange conditions I have been obliged to pass through, how much I had to suffer before the will became fully broken down, annihilated, as it were, not only in its selfish operations, but in its selfish tendencies, and changed in its very nature. How many persons there are, who think their wills are quite lost, when they are far from it. In hard temptations and trials they would find that a will submissive is not a will lost; a will not rebellious is not a will annihilated."

We have already quoted a few sentences descriptive of her feelings when she attained, as she thought, the higher state of unselfish love, or perfection. She added, "By this inward liberty I mean a liberty from that secret power within us which continually draws us to evil." Nine years later, we find her, in a letter to Fenelon, carrying the distinction still farther and affirming that the soul may not be perfect even when active repugnance to God's will has ceased. "The disapprobation or unselfishness of the will is not to be regarded as perfect, merely because the will is broken down and submissive to such a degree as to have no repugnance whatever to anything which God in his providence may see fit to send. In a mitigated sense, the will, under such circumstances may be regarded as dead, but in the true and absolute sense, there is still in it a lingering life. There still remains a secret tendency, resulting from former selfish habits, to look back, as it were, with feelings of interest upon what is lost; in other words, it puts forth its purposes a little less promptly and powerfully in some directions, than it would have done if it had been required to act in others." Fenelon insisted on the same distinction. In a letter to Madam G., summing up her views, he says,

"In this state the will is not only subdued, but all tendency to a different or rebellious state is taken away. The soul now acts or suffers, acts or is inactive, just as God would have it to be; and, as it does this without the trouble of overcoming contrary dispositions, it does it without pain. It may suffer in its outward relations; it may suffer for others; there may be suffering in various degrees in the natural sensibilities, but all selfishness and all tendency to selfishness being taken away, it no longer suffers in its interior and central nature. The soul departing from itself, as that self was, enters fully into God, and not only becomes one with him in the conformity of obedience, but one with him in the entire concurrence and harmony of the spiritual nature." Accordingly these writers make the distinction between the state in which selfish desires are crucified, and that in which they are extinct. The state of perfection was sometimes called the state of non-desire—an expression which Fenelon criticises as convenient, but not correct. Constitutional desires being admitted to exist, he explains, that "the motive of God's glory so expands itself and so fills the mind, that the other motive, that of our own happiness, becomes so small and so recedes from our inward notice, as to be practically annihilated." We suppose he would say that the love of family, of ease, of society, the dread of pain may still exist; but when duty conflicts with these, the love of God is so overwhelming in the holy soul, that these natural feelings yield at once and present no obstacle, stepping aside like loyal and reverent crowds before the coming of the king. They are therefore no appreciable barrier to the discharge of duty. Relatively, therefore, though not absolutely, they are nothing, and, according to the beautiful sentiment of one of Cowper's translations from Madam Guyon,

"All scenes alike engaging prove  
To souls impressed with sacred love ;  
Where'er they dwell, they dwell in thee,  
In heaven, in earth or on the sea."

The language of some of the foregoing extracts may be open to criticism; but the distinction which these writers had in view is real and important. It is certainly possible to refuse all indulgence to corrupt desires, and so to have the will set on God's service that every executive volition shall be to do God's will, so that from day to day the man may not be conscious of one executive volition, of one distinctly formed purpose to displease God. But if, through the remains of corrupt nature or the effects of sinful habit, there be any reluctance to duty, if it be not all delightful, easy, natural, if constitutional propensities show their yet inordinate strength by resistance, if evil thoughts and evil desires are rushing into the soul, even though the strong hand of the will instantly seize and throttle them, if the soul move less promptly to serve God in some directions than in others, in a word, if there exist in the heart any obstacles to obedience other than such as existed in the heart of the man Christ Jesus, then is the claim to perfection utterly delusive. We are never perfect till the effects of corrupt nature and of sinful habit are eradicated, till self-denial ceases in the extinction of all tendency to selfishness and not the mere restraining of it till we are restored to a state of spontaneous, delightful, universal coincidence with God's will, till all our tendencies are upward and we find like the angels,

"That in our proper motion we ascend  
Up to our native seat; descent and fall  
To us is adverse;" —

till in a word we can enter into the very spirit of Jesus when he said, "Lo, I come; I delight to do thy will, O God."

It would seem plain to common sense that perfection is nothing less than this; that a man cannot be

perfect till he not only refuses to gratify corrupt tendencies and desires, but till they actually cease to exist; till the enemy within is not only constantly bound or even nailed to the cross, but actually dead. And this is the perfection required in the Bible, which holds up not several kinds of perfection, but a perfection one in principle with that of angels and with that of God; which, heedless of all men's self-flatteries, as if another perfection were required of men, does ever say, "Be ye perfect even as your Father in Heaven is perfect," and, "As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation."

The grand error of perfectionism lies not in maintaining that some actually attain perfection in this life. That is a minor and comparatively harmless error, pertaining merely to a question of fact. But the dangerous error is, in teaching that to be perfection which is not—it is the element of antinomianism perpetually appearing—the lowering of the standard of moral obligation, not merely to the capacity, but to the present habits and attainments of men. It lies in teaching men that, as soon as they have met with some remarkable manifestation of God's love, and have lived a little while without consciously determining to displease God—so soon as they "subdue the will in its operations," while it is unsubdued "in its life," they are perfect men. Thus are men puffed up with delusion, God's law is dishonored, the soul, safe in imagined holiness, suffers and does great evil, and errors and abuses come in apace. Madam Guyon is chargeable with no such antinomianism. Indeed she is frequently charged with the very opposite, with fixing a standard of perfection higher than the Scriptures, which, as Bossuet argued, could not be realized without extinguishing in us the characteristics of humanity.

Madam G. was accustomed to ap-

ply this distinction as a test of character to those with whom she conversed. She says of a woman who called on her, and "who was, according to the ordinary rules of judging, eminently religious," "I saw clearly that it is not great gifts which sanctify, unless they are accompanied with a profound humility. No one can be regarded as sanctified, who is not *wholly dead to self*. This woman, in connection with her great intellectual lights, and her strong emotions, and the true faith which she really possessed, regarded herself as a *truly holy* person; but the developments of her subsequent life, originating as they obviously did in the remains of self, showed that she was very far from the state which she professed." On this subject Prof. Upham makes the following judicious remarks, which we commend to the consideration of all perfectionists: "There are some persons, who, in addition to the rectification of the outward nature, have had a degree and kind of inward experience which is truly remarkable. It is not an experience which, properly speaking, can be described as sanctification; but it is sometimes taken for it. These persons have been much exercised on the subject of a holy life; they have experienced much anxiety in regard to it; and in consequence of the new views which they have had, and the inward victories they have obtained, have been the subjects of a high degree of joy. Sometimes the joy, owing in part, I suppose, to some peculiarities of mental character, is sudden, intense, overwhelming. They suppose themselves wholly and forever conquerors. Not being in a situation fully to analyze their feelings, either their origin, their nature, or permanency, it is not wonderful that they make mistakes, and that they ascribe wholly to grace what is partly due to nature; attributing to religion, which is always benevolent and pure, what belongs to phy-

ysical or selfish excitement. Experience often shows, that the sanctification which they profess under such circumstances, has not those elements of kindness, of forbearance and meekness, of permanent faith and of *inward subjection and nothingness*, which are necessary to characterize it as true."

If correct views of the nature of sanctification prevail, few will believe that it is ever attained in this life, and, if any do, the question will be merely a question of fact, and comparatively unimportant. As Prof. Upham remarks, "If sanctification is such a work as we have represented it to be, so thoroughly explorative and renovating, and if it be generally understood to be what it really is, people will be cautious in making the profession." And if here and there a person of enthusiastic temperament, like Madam Guyon, believes that he has actually attained *such* perfection, there can be but few, and their example will be comparatively harmless. We do not say that we regard Madam G.'s views of the nature of sanctification, as precisely coincident with truth. The language of the Quietists was peculiar, and is with some difficulty reduced to the common theological language of our day. But she exhibits views deserving well to be studied by many who have adopted more loose and even antinomian sentiments on this subject.

We deem it of consequence, that the members of our own churches should have clear apprehensions of the scriptural theory of Christian perfection, and of the reason why we oppose perfectionism as dangerous. We have sad apprehensions that, in opposing perfectionism, some regard us as teaching that Christians are to be expected knowingly and deliberately to sin; that the indefinite apprehension that perfection is never to be attained in this life, is a flattering unction for stupidity and

conformity to the world, for intentional determinations to neglect duty, for yielding to temptation notwithstanding the remonstrances of conscience and the conviction that by yielding God will be displeased. Let it be known, then, that the perfection, which we hold is never attained in this life, is the true perfection which not only leads us not to determine to do wrong, but which delivers us from all desire or tendency so to do. God expects his children to deny invariably all desires and tendencies to sin. But if the man does this, and does it with unusual manifestations of God to his soul, we preach a still higher perfection, which will never be reached till all *tendency* to sin, whether springing from habit or from nature, ceases, till all reluctance to duty is gone, till submission to all God's law and all his providence is delightful, and the soul has no feelings different from what Christ would have had in the same circumstances. Therefore we regard perfectionism as dangerous, not because it requires too much, but because it requires too little.

There is another peculiarity in Madam G's theory of perfection, found in her little work, *The Method of Prayer*. It is, that if a perfect soul sin, it will certainly know it. "When souls have attained this degree of religious experience, no fault escapes reprobation. If a soul, in this intimate nearness to God, should be left to fall into any error or sin, it would immediately be thrown into the greatest confusion and inward condemnation." This seems reasonable. Adam and Eve, when they sinned, must instantly have perceived an awful change in their inward state. So it would seem necessary as to a soul in which the life of self has ceased, and, according to one of Madam Guyon's beautiful expressions, the will, being dead in itself, is raised again and magnified into the will of God, that

if such a soul sin, it must feel the shock, and "give signs of woe." Dr. Upham, in his work, *The Interior or Hidden Life*, does not concur with this sentiment. On page 277, (third edition,) he teaches that *all* must make confession of sin, urging as one reason that there may be sins "not obvious to ourselves." He asks, "Who, then, is able, either on philosophical or scriptural principles, to assert *absolutely and unconditionally*, that he has been free from sin, at least for any great length of time?" We never could see, we may remark in passing, why this admission does not cut off absolutely all claims to perfection as an actual attainment.

We welcome this book as making generally accessible a distinct and intensely interesting aspect of Christian experience. It would be the height of bigotry to suppose that there can not be true and elevated piety, unless it be developed precisely in the mode most familiar to us. While Christian experience is in all times and places fundamentally the same, it has its peculiar phases and ways of development under different circumstances. Different parts of the system of truth assume peculiar prominence in the Christian experience of different sects and times. Nor is there a study more interesting than the study of Christian experience—to begin with the piety of Abel, who with one line of gospel, believed unto salvation; to examine the wonderful sameness, yet the endless diversity of Christian experience in all ages, and nations; to note how it has been modified by incomplete, erroneous, or disproportionate views of truth, how by varying circumstances and organizations, what excrescences have grown on it and why, how it has expended its energies in the improvement of men, and under what circumstances it has received its most complete and successful development. Less of such inductive reasoning on Christian ex-

perience has there been than is desirable, and we welcome books which furnish new materials or heretofore scarcely accessible materials for prosecuting it. Perhaps the church would not suffer if a part of the energies expended in the discussion of abstract doctrine, were employed in elucidating Christian experience, and in examining doctrines in their immediate relations to it. It is well that there has been so immense labor bestowed on the difficulties of Paul. Would it not be well were there more bestowed on the greater difficulties, the sublimer mysteries of John—in considering what is meant by being one with Christ, by dwelling in him and he in us, by the mystical union as of the branch with the vine, and what it is to have within us the well of water springing up unto everlasting life, and to experience the power of the Comforter, whose coming was to make it expedient for us that Christ should go away, as more than making good his place?

Christian experience is the essence of religion, the life of the church. Far be the day when it shall be undervalued, or the sentiment of the churches shall esteem unnecessary or of secondary consequence, its deepest and most powerful developments. For some years past, it has been the common theme of missionary meetings and other great convocations, that there must be a higher spiritual piety in the churches. As yet, little increase of this spirituality has been seen. God grant that this cry of the churches may be like the moan of the wind before the coming rain. As a means of furthering this object, we

welcome enquiries into the nature of the higher life; and we welcome books which unfold the struggles, the errors, and the success of earnest souls in seeking it. Especially we welcome them when written in the beautiful spirit which pervades Prof. Upham's works on Christian experience. And we hope yet more and more to see the church and the ministry engaged in studying this great subject—not in the arid spirit of controversialists, but in the spirit of earnest seekers after God,—and learning from every source, our dangers and our errors, the relative importance of every grace, and every sentiment, and every doctrine in the divine life. Let it not be deemed unpardonable to suggest that we, in this age so exclusively intellectual, so intensely active, may yet be taught in some points by the despised and condemned Quietists; that we may not have given due prominence to sentiments which they, perhaps, carried to excess. It has been common for different sects to hold some one or two of the doctrines and graces of Christianity preëminent, as the jewel of their system. Be it ours to strive to hasten on the time, when, from their separate caskets all these jewels of truth and grace shall be brought together, and the brow of every Christian show to the believing world, as they have never seen it, all the combined splendors of the crown of righteousness; till the church on earth shall stand in the likeness of the new Jerusalem above, having her foundation of sapphires, her gates of carbuncles, and all her borders of precious stones.

## PUTNEY PERFECTIONISM.\*

NOTHING which affects the great truths of the Gospel is unimportant. The history of religious opinions especially, which is but a view of the workings of the human mind brought into contact with the claims of God, is full of instruction. In the origin and rise of any peculiar tenets, the mode in which they arrange themselves into a system, the relations they form to other systems of truth or error, and the practical results to which they lead in the lives of their votaries, we find much to illustrate the philosophy of the mind, and to guide us in the formation of our own opinions. Especially is it conceived that doctrines which spring up and ripen on the soil of our own New England, however apparently insignificant from their obscurity or absurdity, can not fail to awaken the interest and the notice of all who claim descent from the truth-loving fathers of New England.

Many of our readers remember, doubtless, the Perfectionism which was promulgated in New Haven and the vicinity, some twelve or fifteen years since; and which, having wrought its mischiefs in distressing and dividing several of the smaller churches, gradually disappeared from view, and has since been supposed to be numbered among "the things that were." Such, however, is not the fact. We know, indeed, little of what its history has been since; but we learn that it has been transplanted, and is, in some measure, now flourishing in Vermont. An establishment, based substantially on the principles of the Community system, is in operation at Putney in that state, where

are assembled a considerable number of 'believers' under the leadership, as it would seem, of Mr. Noyes, who was one of the first advocates, if not the father of the system, at New Haven. Other disciples are scattered abroad through most of the northern states, to the number, it is supposed, of from seven hundred to a thousand. A bi-monthly periodical,—the "Spiritual Magazine," is their organ of communication with the world; and from this and other sources, we learn that they believe their views to be spreading, and the general condition of the sect to be highly encouraging.

The book, whose title we have given above, is a large and handsome octavo of 504 pages, composed wholly of essays and other articles which Mr. Noyes had previously contributed to the various periodicals that have at different times been devoted to this faith. They are written with great vigor of style, and, except when occasionally obscured by mysticism, with great clearness; and are well adapted to impress a mind inclined to this sort of religious speculation. Though lacking formal coherency, it is yet easy to deduce from them a system of doctrine possessing unity, and a good degree of consistency with itself; an outline of which we propose to exhibit, as a specimen of the theological rarities that may be found not a thousand miles from home.

We begin with the views which this work presents of the nature, properties, and laws of spirits and spiritual beings, including the soul of man. This is a point of prime importance to the right understanding of other parts of the system. Mr. Noyes asks—

"What is a Spirit?—We answer: It is a fluid, having many of the properties

\* The Berean: a manual for the help of those who seek the faith of the primitive church. By John H. Noyes. Published at the office of the Spiritual Magazine, Putney, Vt.

of calorific, light, electricity, galvanism and magnetism; and in addition to these, having powers of assimilation, growth, and self-originated motion, being susceptible of personality, feeling, intelligence and will.

"We freely confess that we are so far materialists, that we believe there is no such vast chasm between spirit and matter as is generally imagined, but that the two touch each other, and have properties in common—that calorific, light, electricity, galvanism and magnetism, are in some sense connecting links between the material and spiritual worlds—that spirit is in many respects like these fluids, and is as truly substantial as they. We do not ascribe to spirit 'length, breadth and thickness,' in the common acceptation of those words, because the nature of all fluids precludes those properties. Yet if a specific portion of any fluid is separated from the mass and confined in a solid vessel, that portion of fluid assumes the length, breadth and thickness of the vessel. So if a specific portion of spirit or life is confined in an animal form, that life assumes the length, breadth and thickness of that form. *In this sense we believe that spirits have length, breadth and thickness.*"—pp. 55, 56.

A broad distinction is made between the spirit and the soul, thus—

"A soul is a *modification* of spirit, produced by union with a material body. What is the nature of that modification, which distinguishes a soul from mere spirit? We answer:—1. When the vital fluid from God entered into combination with Adam's body, that fluid took the *form* of that body. It certainly animated every part of it; of course it existed in every part, was as large as all the parts, and had the form of the whole. A soul then is distinguished from mere spirit in this respect, viz., the former, like the body, has a *definite shape*; while the latter, like air and other fluids, has none. 2. The spirit which God breathed into Adam's body, by its intimate union with every part of that body, and by its consequent intercourse with various material substances, as food, air, &c., necessarily received into itself some of the properties of matter. As Adam's body was spiritualized matter, so conversely, Adam's soul was *materialized spirit*. This modification places the soul in a middle position between mere spirit and matter; and in conjunction with the first mentioned modification, accounts for the fact that souls, according to the representations of Scripture, have the forms and functions of bodies, and are definite visible substances to spiritual eyes." (See Luke

\* Having sex too, as Mr. N. says elsewhere, which they will retain in heaven!

16: 22, 23, &c.; Rev. 6: 9.) The spirit which God breathed into Adam's form, was a mere fluid, without definite form, and without material cohesiveness. If it had been instantly withdrawn, before a permanent union of it with matter was formed, it would doubtless have remained an incohesive fluid—an undistinguished part of the whole spirit of life. But as soon as it entered into combination with the dust-formed body, it received the shape and cohesiveness of that body—became partially indurated or congealed; so that it ever afterward retained a definite shape, and of course an identity separate from that of the universal spirit of life. If this were not so,—if the soul were a mere fluid spirit, when the body dies that spirit would return into the abysses of life from whence it came, and lose its identity; just as a portion of water, taken from the ocean, when its vessel is broken, returns and is distinguished no more."—pp. 57, 58.

We do not propose to comment very largely on these and other opinions which we meet in this work, much less attempt to refute them. We should about as soon think of carrying logic to Bedlam. They are adduced rather as curious specimens—*rare aves*—in mental and theological science, which we leave to the reader to inspect and judge of for himself. A single remark only is suggested by the above theory, that it presents a new, and in some respects convenient method of ascertaining the mental capacities of mankind. If the soul has the *form, shape and size* of the body,—is 'as large as all its parts,' and fills it as water fills the vessel which contains it, then evidently, we have only to measure the body itself, as a gauger measures the capacity of a cask, to learn the magnitude of the soul within. Estimated by this rule, there are certainly some *great men* in this world, of whom fame has not yet spoken!

Starting with this theory of the nature of the mind, it becomes an easy matter to investigate its properties and laws. These are developed in the doctrines of *Mesmerism*. For since the soul or animal life is a *fluid of the same generic class*

with caloric, electricity, magnetism, &c., it is apparent that its phenomena must be similar to theirs; and hence the 'science' of animal magnetism. This, we are told, is the only true metaphysics,—the only philosophy which gives any correct knowledge of the mind, or exhibits on just principles its functions and operations. Mr. N., as we shall see, makes it the key to the explanation of all spiritual matters and all the doctrines of the Gospel, and builds upon it, in short, his whole theological system.

After detailing some marvelous experiments said to have been performed in 1842, by Dr. Buchanan of Kentucky, an account of which was communicated by Robert D. Owen, in an article in the New York Evening Post, our author finds in them "a theory which establishes the possibility, and explains the philosophy of all the wonderful works by which the origin of Christianity was attested."

"In the light of this theory, what is there incredible in the accounts which we have of Christ's healing the sick? It is evident that the effect was produced by a fluid that passed from him to his patients. He usually *laid his hands* on them. What was this but a means of establishing communication between him and them, by which the vital fluid might pass? The case of the woman who was healed of an issue of blood, recorded in Luke 8: 43-48, shows positively that the healing power of Jesus Christ was a fluid that passed from him, as electricity passes from the machine that generates it. She touched the hem of his garment and was healed. And he 'perceived that virtue was gone out of him.' Here is evidence, not only of a transmitted fluid, but of the passage of that fluid independently of the will of Jesus, and by means of an inanimate conductor. *This is all in accordance with the laws of Animal Magnetism.* At least it does not contradict them, and is no more mystical than the operations of Dr. Buchanan.

"It is only necessary to suppose that the battery of vital energy in Jesus Christ was immensely stronger than in Dr. B.—different in degree, not in kind—in order to account for the principal discrepancies between Christ's system of operation, and modern neurology. The vital power of Dr. B. is so feeble that he finds only

here and there an individual with nerves weak enough to receive any sensible impression from him. Whereas the spirit of Jesus Christ was so mighty that all who applied to him were found 'impressible.' The battery was so heavily charged, that its fluid passed where faith attached it, without any vehicle but a word. A few cases even are recorded, in which cures were performed without either word or contact, and with a great distance between the operator and the subject. Dr. B. could sensibly effect a person at the distance of forty feet by means of a metallic conductor. But Jesus Christ healed the centurion's servant (Matt. 8: 5) at a distance probably of miles, and without any wire between. The centurion's faith, which Christ pronounced unparalleled, was the only conductor.

"Perhaps in the progress of his investigation, Dr. Buchanan will find means to increase his nervous powers either by self-training, or availing himself of the power of others. But he will never approach equality with Christ, as a practical neurologist, till he establishes communication with God the great source of vital energy. There is no danger that the miracles of Christ will ever be rivalled by more human neurologists. The stream can not rise above its fountain; and so long as mere human life is the fountain of magnetic influence, its effects will only be proportioned to the weakness of human nature.—Nevertheless we say again, that the miracles of Jesus Christ, as recorded by the evangelists, were evidently, as to their philosophical nature, and the process by which they were performed, operations of the same kind with the experiments of Dr. Buchanan; certainly not more mysterious—different only in the degree of their power."—pp. 76, 77.

These assertions, though uttered by one who is absolutely perfect, and 'can not sin,' are audacious if not blasphemous. The miracles of the Son of God, of the same kind with the manipulations of some juggling mesmerizer! And Christianity rests, not on the authority of his works in actually suspending and reversing all natural laws, but only on his display of skill and power superior to those of other magnetizers! What, pray, could Robert Dale Owen, or any other infidel, desire beyond this statement? And how far is it from the charge alledged against Christ by the Pharisees of old; "He casteth out devils by Beelzebub the prince

of the devils?"—or from incurring the condemnation pronounced in Matt. 12: 31, 32?

We must pass with the briefest possible notice, many of the curiosities of opinion contained in this book. Among them is Mr. N.'s idea of the mode of God's existence.

"In relation to the Godhead, we agree with Trinitarians on the one hand, that Jesus Christ is a divine person, co- eternal with the Father, and was his agent in the work of creation. But we agree with Unitarians on the other hand, that the Father is greater than he, and that the Holy Spirit is not a distinct person, but an emanation from the Father and the Son. We believe not in the Trinity, nor the Unity, but in the *Duality* of the Godhead; and that Duality in our view, is imaged in the twofold personality of the first man, who was made 'male and female!' Gen. 1: 27. As Adam was to Eve, so is the Father to the Son; i. e., he is the same in nature, but greater in power and glory.—The Father and the Son are concentric spiritual spheres. Their relations to each other are those of male and female. The Father fills the Son, and is enveloped by him. The Son envelopes the Father and is filled by him. Though in a subordinate sense it is true that each fills and each envelopes the other—that the Son dwells in the Father as well as the Father in the Son, (for to a certain extent, in all combinations of spirits, there is an interchange of relations and functions)—yet in a general sense, it is evident from Scripture that the Father is the interior life and the Son the exterior. Thus in the prayer of Christ, the order of indwelling is indicated in these words;—'That they may be one as we are one; *I in them and Thou in me.*' The Father is the indwelling life of the Son, as the Son is the indwelling life of believers. That the relation of the Father to the Son is that of interior to exterior, or male to female, appears also from these words of Paul;—'The head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God.' 1 Cor. 11: 13. It is obvious that in all combinations the interior life must be more compact, and therefore stronger than the exterior. The female capacity is in its very nature negative. Weakness makes room for strength. Deficiency embraces fullness. Hence the Father takes precedence of the Son. 'My Father,' says Christ, 'is greater than I.' —pp. 5, 488.

Mr. N.'s opinions in regard to the prince of evil, though scarcely less singular and fanciful, are not equal-

ly novel. They are in some respects a revival of ancient Manicheism. Satan is declared to be an uncreated, self-existent, eternal being, originally and essentially evil; and as such is the first cause and creator—*principium et fons*—of all sin. The Gordian knot respecting the existence of moral evil in the world, which theologians have had so much difficulty in untying, is thus solved at a stroke!

We pass to notice the views of Perfectionism respecting the doctrines of Christianity—beginning with the *fall of man*.

All men, in their natural state, are depraved, but not *alike* depraved. Adam was originally holy, after the divine image. In his temptation in Eden, however, Satan contrived to bring him within the attraction of his own sinful spirit, and by the known laws of animal magnetism, subject him to the impulses of his will. Hence he sinned; and by sin rendered his subjection to Satanic influence permanent. "The streams from the two eternal fountains," (i. e. God, and Satan) "flowed together in him. His spiritual nature was primarily good, as proceeding from God; but secondarily evil, as pervaded by the devil. With this compound character, he had the power of propagating his own likeness. As the offspring of Adam's body was two-fold, distinguished into male and female, part following the nature of the primary, and part the nature of the secondary parent; so the offspring of his spiritual nature was two-fold, distinguished, like that nature, into good and evil, part following the character of the primary, and part the character of the secondary spiritual element. In other words, Adam had two sorts of spiritual children; one of them like himself, primarily of God and secondarily of the devil, of whom Abel was a specimen; the other primarily of the devil and second-

arity of God, of whom Cain was a specimen. See 1 John 3: 12. Thus mankind are divided spiritually into two classes of different origins, classes, proceeding respectively from uncreated good and evil. The depravity of mankind then, is of two sorts. The seed of the woman are depraved, as Adam was after the fall,—not in their original individual spirits which are of God, but “*by their spiritual combination with and subjection to the Devil*”—in the same way, we suppose, as the subject of mesmerism is ‘in spiritual combination with, and subjected to’ the operator. “On the other hand, the seed of the serpent are depraved as Cain was, not only by combination with and subjection to the devil, but by original spiritual identity with him. They are not only possessed of the devil, but are *radically devils themselves*.”—pp. 104, 105. In a word, the former are wicked, just as the otherwise honest man placed in magnetic slumber by a thief, and those ‘in combination with and subjected to him, is made to perform dishonest acts; the latter are intrinsically wicked, like him who is, essentially and *per se*, a thief himself! Both however, it is declared, are morally free, and therefore responsible for their acts. The satanic influence extends only to the *disposition*, not to the *powers* of him who is its subject.

There is, evidently, a fundamental difference between these two sorts of depravity. In the one case, the spiritual attraction and control of Satan needs but to be broken, and the victim of it is speedily reclaimed to holiness. In the other, the individual being radically and inherently evil, is like Satan himself, irreclaimable. The former has the “honest and good heart,” (Luke 8: 15) which, when the word is sown, brings forth good fruit; the latter is intrinsically hard, sterile, and unproductive.

And here lies the foundation of the divine purpose of Election and Reprobation. Foreseeing that a part of mankind, as the ‘seed of the woman,’ are not inherently evil, and may therefore be rescued from the power of Satan, God chose them to salvation; and foreseeing that the rest, as the ‘seed of the devil,’ are ‘radically devils themselves,’ and therefore wholly incorrigible, he leaves them to their own depravity, and final destruction.

But the power of Satan over mankind, is not, according to Mr. N., confined to the production of moral evil only;—it is no less directly concerned in the origination of natural evil also, sickness, suffering, and death. Bearing in mind the definition of a *spirit* before given, as ‘a fluid having many of the properties of caloric, light, electricity, galvanism, and magnetism,’ we shall understand the exposition of the devil’s agency, as follows—

“Satan’s spirit is an atmosphere that envelopes mankind, pressing (we may say, figuratively) like the air, with a weight of fifteen pounds on every square inch of human life. Wherever there is a vacuum in men’s hearts, there that spirit enters, and manifests itself in selfishness, covetousness, and all evil works. Wherever the laws of life are violated, either physically or spiritually, there that spirit infuses its poison, aggravating and perpetuating the injury. ‘We know,’ says the Apostle, ‘that the whole world lieth in the wicked one.’”

“If a man is afflicted with fever or epilepsy, instead of looking into his blood or his nerves, his hereditary constitution or his diet, for the ultimate cause, we go back with Jesus Christ to the vital principle, and ascribe his disease to the power of an evil spirit. In holding these views of the ultimate cause of human maladies, we are not obliged to overlook or disregard secondary causes. All those external influences and acts which are ordinarily regarded by physicians and metaphysicians as the *causes*, we admit are the *occasions* of disorder in the economy of human nature, and we attach due importance to them as such. If a man in a state of perspiration exposes himself to a current of air, takes cold, is prostrated by fever, and dies, we do not attribute his death to the devil irrespective of his

own acts, and the physical influences which operated upon him. But we call the action of the air upon his body, and the consequent corruption of his blood, the predisposing causes or occasions of his death, and the power of the devil the ultimate cause. We say that by his imprudence, he exposed himself to a fatal influx of spiritual poison, and so the devil killed him. If a ship strikes a rock, springs a leak, and finally sinks, the collision and the leak are in popular language, the causes of the disaster. But strictly speaking, the water which ran in at the leak sank the ship. So the cold and the fever may properly be called, in common language, the causes of the man's death; but, strictly speaking, the power of the devil, which rushed in at the opening made by the cold and the fever, killed him.

"For the purpose of embarrassing our position, physiologists may ask whether a man might hold his hand in the fire without injury, if there was no devil? We answer; unless a proper miracle (as in the case of Shadrach and his companions) should suspend the laws of nature, the man's hand would undoubtedly be burned and he would suffer pain. But there would be this difference between his case and ordinary cases at present; viz. there would be no subsequent inflammation, no chronic ulceration; the power of life would speedily repair the injury: whereas, under the poisonous influence of Satan, external wounds sometimes expand into permanent and fatal disease, and the cure of them is often protracted and difficult. Thus while we may admit that in a world free from diabolical power, external injuries, both physical and spiritual, would be possible, yet we affirm that there would be no *vital* and *chronic* disease either of soul or body."—pp. 116, 117.

This theory of disease, as we shall see in the sequel, lays the foundation for a new system of therapeutics, which Mr. Noyes claims, is destined to heal all human ills, and actually to abolish death itself; so that the believer shall step directly from mortality to immortality without passing through the "gloomy gates" at all!

We come next to the system of Redemption, provided for the deliverance of mankind from the bondage of sin and Satan.

The *design* of the Atonement was not, as we are wont to suppose, to sustain the divine law while pardon

is offered to the guilty. This is a 'legal,' not a 'spiritual' view of the matter. But it was to *break the power of the devil*;—to destroy, in other words, the mesmeric control which he had gained over the race, and thus to set them free from all the evils, physical and moral, which are caused by it.

The *mode* in which Christ accomplishes this is explained as follows.—1. He became incarnate, and thus, "the strength of the Godhead was brought into immediate contact with the strength of the devil, in the very field which was to be won." Satan had obtained absolute control over mankind and brought them, as we have seen, 'into spiritual combination with and subjection to' him. In order that Christ might get access to him, in these circumstances, it was needful that he also should take on him human nature, and in this way, bring his enemy within the sphere of his own magnetic attraction.—2. Christ and Satan having thus, in the human nature, come within reach of each other's magnetic influence, "a desperate conflict commenced":—Satan endeavoring to seduce him into sin; Christ baffling his efforts, overcoming his power, and as the fruits of victory, healing the sick, casting out devils, &c.; in a word, disenthraling all who resorted to him, from the poisonous spirit of Satan in which they had been enveloped. Some idea of the nature of this conflict, may be formed, by imagining two potent mesmerizers striving for a predominant influence over a subject who had come under the control of the one, from which the other attempts to release him. Satan strives not only to keep the subject, but to magnetize his opponent also. Christ, on the contrary, by his superior power, not only frustrates the latter attempt, but wrests from his grasp the victim also.—3. As by far the largest portion of the whole family of mankind were the

dead, in the spirit-world, where Satan 'held them by the double chain of sin and death;' and since, 'in that same inner world, the devil had his sanctuary,' it became necessary for Christ to enter that world also, to complete his triumph over his enemy, in his capital. Therefore he suffered Satan for a time to gain the mastery over him, and subject him to death; the *modus* of which must be given in Mr. N.'s own words.

"The death of Christ was a *spiritual baptism into the devil*, of which the corporeal crucifixion was only an index and consummation. A day, at least, before his crucifixion, he said to the people, 'Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour; but for this cause came I unto this hour. \* \* \* Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out.' John 12: 27, 31. He was then entering the cloud of death. A few hours before when he was alone with his disciples his 'soul was exceeding sorrowful **EVEN UNTO DEATH.**' The magnetism of the devil was upon him,—as was indicated by the drowsiness of the disciples, as well as by his own bloody agony. With a desperate purpose of either corrupting or destroying him, Satan poured himself out upon the Son of God, thus interposing his own black spirit between the sufferer and his Father, and causing him to drink of the cup of that fury which was drawn forth from God, not by his sin, but by the sin of Satan. In that baptism, the devil and the Son of God met face to face—their respective strength was tried to the uttermost—and the devil was overcome and cast out. Thus Christ became what the devil had been before the prince of this world—the Lord of the living and the dead.

"The sum of what we have said, is this: Jesus Christ by his death, entered into the vitals of the devil, and overcame him. He thus destroyed the central cause of sin. The effect of this act on them that believe, is to release them from the power of sin; and on them that believe not, to consign them with the devil, to destruction."—pp. 122-129.

But if the atonement was not designed to sustain the divine law while the guilty are pardoned, how, we ask, is that law sustained, and the honor of God preserved unimpaired? Ans. 'By an imputation

of sin;—but it is such an imputation, it is presumed, as has not even been heard of at Princeton.

"This view enables us to understand how the sins of the world are disposed of. Instead of being imputed by a sort of legal fiction to Christ, to whom they do not belong, they are fairly *laid upon the head of the devil*, to whom they do belong. 'The old serpent that deceiveth the whole world' is legitimately made the scape goat of the whole world. A king, in dealing with a revolted province, may properly make a distinction between the guilt of the common people, and that of the leading instigators of the rebellion. When he has captured the ring leader and made a public example of him, he may safely forgive the rest—not imputing their trespasses unto them, but to their seducer. With these views, we can see how God can be 'just, and the justifier of him that believeth'—how the law which immutably joins death to sin, can be faithfully carried into execution, and yet man be saved. The penalty of all sin is actually inflicted on the devil, who is actually the author of it. Here is no evasion,—no substitution of an innocent person for the offender. The law has its course. Man is saved, not because God abrogates the law, or evades it by a fiction, but because he rightfully imputes the sins of which men are the instruments, to the devil as their real author."—p. 127.

The *blessings* procured for man through the atonement, come next under consideration.

As we have seen above, the effect of Christ's death upon those who are the subjects of the greater degree of depravity—the 'seed of the serpent'—is absolute hopeless destruction, in common with Satan, their spiritual father. But to the others, who are only *mesmerically* depraved,—i. e. who, having naturally an 'honest and good heart,' have been brought 'into spiritual combination with and subjection to the devil,' redemption is designed to be co-extensive with the fall. Holiness, the favor of God, spiritual communication with him, life,—all things, in short, which were lost in the apostasy—are regained by the atonement.

The *mode* in which these blessings are attained by believers, corresponds to that in which they were

originally lost. As Satan, by throwing around them the sphere of his spiritual influence, brought them into subjection to him, so they are delivered from this state of thralldom and death, by coming into spiritual union and identity with Christ. The way in which this is effected, is explained thus:—

Christ said, ' Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.' Now *blood is the life*, (Gen. 9: 4,) the animating fluid of the *flesh or body*. Recurring to the view given in the outset of man's spiritual nature, we see that these correspond to the *spirit and soul*. The spirit, says our author, ' is a concrete substance—it has in all respects the form of the natural body ; it corresponds therefore to flesh. And the spirit is a fluid substance contained in the soul ; it is the life of the soul ; it corresponds therefore to blood. So far as human beings are concerned then, it is proper to apply the terms flesh and blood to the two constituents of their spiritual nature.' And since man was made in the *image of God*, the same thing is true of Him also. ' We may safely conclude, that the Son of God, in his preexistent state, had a soul and a spirit, or a spiritual body and a life within it, which are properly called flesh and blood. These are the elements of which the bread and wine of the Lord's supper are the emblems. It was the breaking of this body and the outpouring of this blood, that took away the sin of the world.'

The process of receiving this body and blood of Christ, is described as a true mesmeric operation. Christ, on his part, first offers himself to man by his word. ' It is a fact well known to spiritualists, that

the word of every spiritual being is an *actual substance*, sent forth from his inward center, carrying with it the properties of his life.' This word, thus surcharged with Christ's spirit, is then received by the individual, in the act of *believing*. It is well known that for a person to come under the magnetic influence, in an ordinary experiment, he must exercise faith ; i. e., believe in its reality, and will to receive it. So in the present case. ' The act of believing actually receives into the soul and spirit, the substance conveyed in the word believed. So that communication by word from one person to another, effects an actual junction of spirits, and conveys to the receiver a portion of the life and character of the communicator. It was with a view to this philosophy, and for the purpose of enforcing it, that Christ chose his language in the sixth of John. He wished to apprise his hearers thoroughly that the intercourse with him, which he called believing on him, was not a mere solitary movement of the believer's own mind, caused by hearing physical sounds, but *a reception of the effluence of his soul and spirit into the believer's soul and spirit*. He would have them understand, that in spiritually receiving his spiritual word, they became identified with him, as really as a man becomes identified with his food in eating and digesting it.'—p. 136.

The result therefore is, that Christ henceforth not only dwells in the believer, but actually becomes one with him ; and that, in the most literal sense, by a union of substance. Says Mr. N. :

' We protest against the idea that Christ's language in the sixth of John is merely figurative. Though it is not true in a physical sense that believers eat and drink the elements of Christ's body, it is true in a spiritual sense, and that sense is as real as the physical. The thing done in eating and drinking, viz., the reception of a nutritious substance into the laboratory of life, is done in imbibing the spiritual elements of Christ's nature ; and the

sensations which attend the two processes, are not so entirely unlike as unspiritual persons may suppose. Every one who has had intercourse with the word of life, knows that its entrance is felt not merely in the mind, by its information, but in the centre of life by its power; and that it causes a sensation of strength, growth, and refreshment. Even the place where it takes effect is coincident with the digestive organs of the body. Christ, speaking of this very intercourse, said on a certain occasion, 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, *out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.*' The idea here is not that rivers of living water shall flow from the believer *abroad*, but from God into him, as Christ said in another place—' Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.' John 4: 14. The expression, '*out of his belly*', indicates that the fountain of the water of life rises in the middle region of the spiritual body, and that coincides with the place where food is elaborated in the natural body."—p. 136.

And this, forsooth, is *Spiritualism*! The ordinary conception of faith as an act of the mind or heart, by which the believer is united to Christ in a bond of love and fellowship, securing pardon and justification on the one hand, and obedience on the other, is 'carnality.' This, which represents Christ as received in *substance* by the believer; and points out the place 'coincident with the digestive organs of the body' where it is assimilated to the believer's substance; and talks of the 'sensations' to which it gives rise,—'not so unlike' that given in the process of literal digestion as might be;—this we must believe is the true spiritual view of this matter,—the only one accordant with the high spirituality of the Gospel! Yet what is this, apart from the figment of a 'spiritual body,' but the very doctrine of Rome, on the subject of the Eucharist? That teaches that the communicant receiving the consecrated wafer, which has been changed into the real substance of Christ, receives Christ himself, his 'body, soul, and divinity,' and becomes

physically as well as spiritually identified with him. Substitute in this dogma, a spiritual body for a physical body; Christ's word for the wafer; believing for literal eating; and you have Perfectionism—in other words, a sort of *mesmeric transubstantiation*!

The reception of Christ into the soul, by the process thus described, conveys to it all the blessings procured by his death for the believer. These are summed up by Mr. Noyes in the four following particulars.

1. *Salvation from all sin*;—including forgiveness for the past, and perfect sanctification. Christ now dwelling in the soul, and becoming identified with it, delivers it from the bondage of Satan, and subjects it wholly to his own spirit and will.

2. *Security from all future sin*. The union of Christ with the soul being everlasting, the deliverance from sin, which it confers, will be perpetual also. 3. *Liberty from external law*. Christ, at his death, abolished all law, civil, ceremonial, and moral. So perfectly identified is he with the believer, that the latter can have no will but that of Christ. Hence, there is to him no longer any necessity of law to secure obedience to right, enforcing its claims by rewards and penalties. "Under the old covenant, God said, 'Do according to all I command you, and ye shall live.' Under the new covenant, when its powers are fully developed, he may safely say, 'Do as you please, for I promise that your pleasure shall be mine. I will write my law on your hearts.'"

But though the law is abolished, the believer is not freed from obligation. The duty of loving God, perfectly and supremely, grows out of the very nature of things; and is consequently immutable and eternal. Its performance is only secured in a better way than by law, viz., by the indwelling Spirit of Christ, with the external co-operation of God's word, and the discipline of his providence.

The believer, therefore, is emancipated from all law; not however so as to be at liberty to sin, but as having, by virtue of his union to Christ, a will which, of itself, will yield a perfect obedience to duty. *He may do what he chooses, yet at the same time he actually will choose to do what is right.* 4. *Independence of all human teaching.* The promise is now fulfilled to believers, 'They shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them.' They have 'an unction from the Holy One, and know all things.' They have from within perfect guidance in all truth and duty, received by personal communication with Christ, who dwells in their souls. Of course, therefore, they are wholly independent of the instructions and opinions of their fellow men. 'Every subject of the new covenant walks in a *sure pathway of truth*, and shall stand, though he be the least in the kingdom of heaven, where John the Baptist would have fallen; he shall stand, though every inhabitant of earth and hell call him a fool, and a madman, and work and watch for his downfall.'

It is in the last two of the alleged blessings of the new dispensation, that the practical antinomianism of this school of Perfectionists originates. For although Mr. N. strenuously repudiates the term, and insists that they alone are striving for the *perfect* fulfillment of the righteousness of the law, yet it is very evident that, in claiming to be freed from its binding power and independent of all human teaching, they open the door for the wildest latitudinarianism and excess. To be sure that they are infallibly guided from within, and that their wills shall always be God's will, is tantamount to believing that do what they may, they are infallibly right and sinlessly holy. Thus, while deny-

ing, as they do, the authority and sanctity of the Christian Sabbath, they claim that they may pursue their secular labors on that day as usual, not only with a good conscience, but with perfect acceptance before God. Such we know to be both the pretensions and the practice of some, at least, among them.

In the preceding four particulars, and their results, therefore, are summed up the blessings of the Gospel to the believer. A fifth, however, will be attained in the 'dispensation of the fullness of times,' viz., the abolition of all disease and death. To this we shall presently allude more fully. These four are granted to all believers, and are absolutely indispensable to true discipleship.

What then shall we say of the saints of the old dispensation, of Christ's disciples during his personal ministry, and of the great body of the Christian church in all ages? Did all these attain perfect holiness on earth? If not, then either they were not true saints and the spiritual children of God, or the above claim of perfection for all believers is not true. Mr. Noyes distinctly admits their imperfection, and then deliberately adopts the former part of the alternative! We give his own words, capitals and all. "We say that none are, or have been *Christians*, in the sense in which Paul was, (if his state corresponded to his preaching,) who have not received **PERFECT HOLINESS, PERFECT SECURITY, PERFECT LIBERTY, AND PERFECT INDEPENDENCE, BY THE BLOOD OF CHRIST.**"—p. 149.

To solve the apparent difficulties involved in this position, he divides mankind into four classes. 1. The *impenitent*, who remain wholly under the reign of sin and Satan. 2. Those who are in a state of '*legality*.' Christ has commenced his work in these, so that though the flesh still reigns, it is yet in conflict with the spirit. They are believers only in the lowest sense of the term,

as merely recognizing the divine authority of Christ, and receiving his instructions. *They are not regenerated*, and therefore *not the sons of God*, but *servants*, under the bondage of the law and consequently subject to sin. They are still on the devil's territory, but in a part of it which Christ has begun to invade, yet has not reduced to submission. This state "comprises all law-bound, sinning religionists, such as even the Jewish saints under the law, the disciples while Christ was in the flesh, the novices of the primitive church, and the pious of the past and present 'Christian' churches." 3. Those who are in a state of justification, "in which the spirit, by marriage with Christ, has prevailed over the flesh, and commenced its reign, but is yet in the mortal body, and thus still in conflict with the flesh." These have passed from darkness to light, from the domain of Satan to the kingdom of Christ. They have been born of God, have become his sons, are emancipated from all sin, freed from the bondage of the law, led by the Spirit,—in a word, are Perfectionists. 4. Those who are *glorified* in heaven;—in whom the spirit has completed its victory over the flesh by the resurrection of the body, and reigns undisturbed.' It is to the second of these classes, that the great body of the church in all ages is assigned. We will let Mr. N. speak here for himself.

"But what shall we do with the experience of the multitude of saints, whose memory the sects delight to honor? All Christendom has abounded with wonderful conversions, and bright manifestations of spiritual piety. Some are ready to overwhelm us with persuasions that such men as Brainerd, Edwards, Payson, and Taylor, were incarnations of true Christianity. Others appeal still more confidently to a different class of models, such as Madam Guyon, Hester Ann Rogers, and William Law. Several whole sects have held some form of the doctrine of holiness, and have more or less extensively experienced and professed 'sanctification.' Is all this to be accounted as nothing? Were not these illustrious men

and women born of God? Has there been no knowledge of the true gospel of holiness among the Wesleyans, and Moravians, and Quakers, and Shakers? These are questions which it behoves us to consider, with modesty and charity on the one hand, and with independence and jealousy for the truth of the Gospel on the other.

"1. As to the ordinary class of pietists in the carnal churches, we shall say nothing. To those who sincerely believe that 'whosoever sinneth hath not seen Christ, neither known him,' (and to such believers we at present address ourselves,) it need not be proved that confessors and professors of sin are not *Christians*, however interesting may be their spiritual history.

"2. Of the more distinguished spiritualists of the churches, David Brainerd may be taken as a fair specimen. The picture which his biography gives of his general experience, is, in essence, a transcript of the seventh chapter of Romans. The Religious Encyclopedia says, he had 'a most humbling and constant sense of his own iniquity, which was a greater burden to him than all his afflictions, great brokenness of heart before God for the coldness of his love, and the imperfection of his Christian virtues.' It is evident that he was through life, *under conviction*, panting after freedom from sin, but never reaching it. Interesting and praiseworthy as such experience was, in the dim light of Brainerd's time, and valuable as it was, as a preliminary to that higher spiritual education which, we trust, awaited him within the veil, *it certainly was not Christian experience*. With him may be classed Edwards, Payson, and nearly all of those who have obtained the highest distinction for piety in the churches.

"3. James Brainerd Taylor's experience was of a higher grade. He came apparently to the very borders of the gospel, where he *saw* clearly the privilege and glory of salvation from sin. He was indeed, a 'burning and shining light,'—the John the Baptist of the doctrine of holiness,—the connecting link between the old dispensation and the new. [But] we alledge, (1.) that in his religious course as a whole, confession of sin was the rule, and confession of holiness the exception; (2.) that he never 'received the promise' of the new covenant, the very essence of which is the pledge of *security* in holiness; (3.) that he gave no evidence of any clear knowledge of the radical distinction between the Jewish and Christian dispensations, the spiritual at-one-ment, the regenerating power of Christ's resurrection, and the Bible standard of the second birth. His views of regeneration did not differ materially

from those of the churches of which he was a member and a minister. If they had, he would have been put under arrest. He never planted himself on the high position that 'he that is born of God sinneth not.' He believed and taught as other ministers do, that conversion to a religion of sin and repentance is regeneration, and, of course, that conversion to holiness is not, of itself, the radical and essential work of grace, but only a very desirable supplement to a sinful regeneration. In view of these facts, we conclude without a scruple, that he did not know the Gospel of the primitive church, and was *not born of God* in the Bible sense. We do not believe that J. B. Taylor himself, if he were now to return from the world of spirits, would find fault with us for thus plainly stating these facts and this conclusion."—pp. 271, 272.

In the same general category he places William Law, Madam Guyon, and the whole class of mystic Perfectionists; and also the Methodists, Moravians, and Shakers. With this specimen of 'modesty and charity' before us, we are impelled, at once, to a very momentous inquiry in respect to the ultimate destiny of these 'sinning religionists.' *Will they finally be saved?*—and if so, *when and how?* Mr. N. does not speak very directly concerning this point, but his opinion may be gathered from the following condensed view of his doctrine respecting the "Last Things."

1. The saints, both Jewish and Gentile, who lived before the resurrection of Christ, having been only in a state of 'legality,' were under the bondage of the devil, and therefore subjected to death, his crowning act of tyranny. At death, they descended to Hades, which was the strong-hold of Satan,—his 'sanctuary,' where they were held 'by the double chain of sin and death.' Now Christ, as we have before seen under the head of the atonement, at his death, went down into that strong-hold of the devil, there overcame and bound the 'strong man,' and spoiled his goods, delivering them forever from his power. Having thus gained the keys of death and hell, he rose from the dead,

and became the first fruits of them that slept. At the destruction of Jerusalem, his second coming took place, as he had predicted in the 24th of Matthew; and which was to be in the lifetime of the generation who were on earth at his crucifixion. This, though *imaged* in that awful catastrophe, was yet properly a spiritual event, transpiring principally in the invisible world. The dead were then raised out of Hades, *not into this world*, to resume their natural bodies, but in their spiritual bodies; and brought into his presence for judgment, when the incorrigibly wicked were sentenced to everlasting punishment, and the rest, having obtained complete deliverance from Satan and sin, when Christ was in Hades, and thus regenerated and made sons of God, were received by him into everlasting life. This was the "first resurrection" and the "first judgment."

2. After the resurrection of Christ, and the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, many of his people, being made by faith spiritual partakers of his resurrection, attained on earth the same deliverance from all sin, which was to be gained by the former saints only in Hades. Such were Paul, and John, and a large number besides, in the primitive church. As many of these as were 'alive and remained' to the coming of Christ, were there gathered 'from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other;' (Matt. 24: 31, 1 Thes. 4: 17,) and with the risen saints, ascended with Christ to glory in heaven. Then commenced another reign of legalism, which has continued down to this day, embracing the present Christian churches. Its subjects, like those of the former legal dispensation, depart at death to Hades, where they too await their final deliverance from sin by the power of the resurrection. And, as a little before the first resurrection occurred, there was a 'ministration of regen-

eration,' in which many attained entire sanctification, so now in these last times, a like ministration of regeneration is beginning to be enjoyed, and perfection is again witnessed on earth. At the close of this period the 'second resurrection' will take place, accompanied by a second and final judgment of both the righteous and the wicked; after which the New Jerusalem will descend to earth and the '*spiritual*' reign of Christ begin, to continue forever.

To this view of the essential doctrines of Christianity, as explained by Mr. Noyes, we subjoin his opinions on some miscellaneous points.

1. In respect to the *Sabbath*. This is held to be purely a Jewish institution, pertaining solely to the former dispensation, and 'altogether adverse to the advance of man into new and true arrangements.' Of course, therefore its observance is not binding on the Christian believer.

2. *Baptism*. There are two kinds of baptism spoken of in the New Testament, that of *water* and that of the Holy Ghost. The former was John's baptism, and belonged only to the old dispensation. The latter alone is *Christian* baptism. Christ's command to the Apostles to baptise in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, referred to spiritual baptism only, and they, in administering water baptism, showed that they misunderstood his meaning, just as they had mistaken the true nature of his kingdom. Perfectionists, therefore, who have far more correct views of this matter than the Apostles, (!) discard the rite and refuse to practice it.

3. The *Lord's Supper*. This too, like Baptism, is *obsolete*, the proper time for observing it, having expired by its own limitation. It was to show forth Christ's death '*till he came*.' But the coming referred to, took place at the destruction of Jerusalem. Therefore, 'if we con-

tinue the observance of it, we must derive our warrant for the practice simply from its expediency, not from its authority.'

4. In respect to the *Church*, or the organization of believers into some visible association. Mr. N. complains that the true Gospel theory on this subject has been generally misunderstood among Perfectionists, and in accounting for the fact, draws a very curious picture of the internal state of a community professing such high attainments in sanctity, and claiming to be under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit.

"The Perfectionist school, at an early period, was tainted with the idea that a sort of 'touch me not' independence which precludes the possibility of unity, is the prime glory of the Gospel of holiness. This idea, which we will call the *doctrine of disunity*, was developed and rendered popular by a variety of causes, some of which we will briefly mention.

1. Perfectionism was an insurrection against the old churches; and insurrections always generate exaggerated theories of independence. 2. A general and undiscriminating reaction against the principles of the churches, carried many into prejudices against things which are good, as well as those which are evil. The tendency and strife was to keep clear of every thing that smelt of the old systems. Confounding the external and invaluable principle of organization, which pervades all things that have life and growth, with the bondage and hatefulness of 'sectarianism' which were seen and had been experienced in the churches, the cry was raised and re-echoed—'Away with all thoughts of organization, mutual dependence, and subordination! Touch not, taste not, handle not these abominations of Babylon!' 3. Crude notions of the 'liberty of the gospel' and of the 'teachings of the Spirit,' and an idea that these privileges are incompatible with union and discipline, contributed to the growth of the doctrine of disunity. 4. Some, doubtless, joined the standard of Perfectionism, not because they loved holiness, but because they were weary of the restraints of the duty doing churches. Perfectionism presented them a fine opportunity of giving full swing to carnality, (!) and at the same time, of glorying over the 'servants' under the law. Persons of this class are the natural friends of anarchy. 5. Private jealousies in relation to leadership, made some Per-

fectionist leaders very fierce against every thing tending to consolidation. 6. All these causes were quickened into increased activity by the partial alliance which took place between Perfectionism and Abolitionism.

"The result was what might have been expected, viz., confusion like that of Babylon,—enmity like that of Ishmael. Men who expect to scatter, who set no value on unity, who despise the precepts and example of the primitive church, in relation to organization and mutual dependence, who nourish their hearts with nothing but centrifugal, insurrectionary principles, who prize individuality and self-will infinitely more than the unity of the body of Christ, and the attractions of brotherly love, will necessarily rush into isolation and anarchy, and stand, each man, like a porcupine, with quills of jealousy sticking out in every direction. Such to a great extent was the state of Perfectionism at one time."—p. 460.

A curious sort of 'Perfection' this, truly! Sinless holiness, if the above be a fair specimen of it, must be far more easily attained, and far more common than is generally supposed. And what is worse still, Mr. Noyes affirms that though there has been some change for the better in the sect, 'the leaven of the doctrine of disunity is by no means yet purged out:' and then adds—

"In the name of all the doctrines of Perfectionism, and of all true lovers of them, we protest against the assumption which has been admitted among us, that we are always to stand aloof from each other, without organization, without concert, expecting without regret, and allowing without resistance, differences and dissensions; as if such an Ishmaelitish state were our natural and peculiar privilege. This assumption is a vile libel on the gospel of holiness."

Differences! dissensions! an Ishmaelitish state! And these among the perfect!—who 'walk in a sure pathway of truth!' Solomon said there is no new thing under the sun, and the above picture confirms his statement, for he tells us of a similar perfectionism in his day. "There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet, is not washed from their filthiness."

Mr. N. has, of late, been laboring to establish a visible organiza-

tion among the brethren, not we should judge on the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, but mainly on that of Charles Fourier,—viz. Association! We learn from the 'Spiritual Magazine' of Oct. 1847, that a convention of the believers in the state of New York, was held a short time previous, in Geneva, at which Mr. N. was present, and that the following resolutions were adopted.

"*Resolved*, That as the kingdom of God is to have an external manifestation, and as that manifestation must be in some form of Association, we will acquaint ourselves with the principles of heavenly Association, and train ourselves to conformity to them as fast as possible.

"*Resolved*, That one of the leading principles of heavenly Association, is the *renunciation of exclusive claim to private property*.

"*Resolved*, That it is expedient immediately to take measures for forming a heavenly Association in central New York."

Previous to this, as early as 1838, an Association was formed in Putney, Vt., on the same principle, we believe, of a community of goods; though it was not till last spring that 'they joined their households under one common roof.' This Association has numbered in the average about forty persons.

As the union with Christ, enjoyed by every believer, sets him above the necessity of man's teaching, it follows, of course, that there can be no recognized *ministry* in the sect. 'All the Lord's people are prophets, all know the Lord.' Any service of this sort that may be desirable, seems at present to be supplied by Mr. N. in person, whose *dicta* are evidently received by the fraternity, with an implicitness entirely due to one who 'walks in a sure pathway of truth.'

5. '*The gift of healing*.' As we intimated in a former part of this article, it is claimed that among the blessings procured for believers by the victory of Christ over Satan, there will be granted, in the dispensa-

sation of the *fullness of the times*, a deliverance from disease and death as well as sin. It will be recollect-  
ed, that these are alledged to be the direct works of the devil. When therefore, the blessings of redemp-  
tion shall be fully enjoyed, and be-  
lievers are wholly rescued from his  
power, they will obtain complete  
freedom from disease and death. This dispensation we are to under-  
stand, has begun at Putney, and the  
brethren there are already enjoying  
the promised deliverance. We give  
Mr. N.'s statement in respect to it,  
from the 'Spiritual Magazine' of  
October last.

"The Association, or church of Per-  
fectionists in this town, was established  
in 1838. This body of persons has been  
from the beginning, withdrawing more  
and more from confidence in the medical  
systems of the world, and relying more  
and more on the power of God. The  
physicians of the town have had but a  
very little practice among them. Their  
diseases, in most cases, have been treat-  
ed on the principles of the faith-practice.  
The fact to be noted is that *not a single  
death has occurred among them*. During  
the same nine years, the average popula-  
tion of the town has been about 1400,  
and the average number of deaths about  
24 annually, or 216 in all. We have paid  
no part of this tax to the king of terrors,  
though our due proportion would have  
been six or seven deaths."

"The fact we have stated is not to be  
attributed to our freedom from sickness.  
We have had a reasonable share of dis-  
eases, both chronic and acute. But they  
have been controlled, as we believe, by  
the power of God; certainly not by the  
power of medicine. Instances of recov-  
ery by faith among us have been very nu-  
merous. We will present a few samples  
of them.

"My own case deserves to be recorded.  
The facts are these. In consequence of  
long and loud speaking, and the wear and  
tear of a laborious life, I contracted in  
1842 a disease of the throat and lungs,  
which deprived me of the use of my  
voice in public, and rendered ordinary  
conversation painful. I was evidently  
threatened with the consumption. At

first, I listened to friends and physicians,  
so far as to make some slight experiments  
of medication, but I obtained no help in  
this way, and finally, in the face of Dr.  
John Campbell's warning and advice, I  
gave up my case to the sole treatment of  
Jesus Christ. I grew worse till Sept.,  
1845, and at that time, had abundant ex-  
ternal reason to expect a speedy death.  
When the symptoms were at the worst,  
Jesus Christ advised me to neglect my dis-  
ease and act as though I was well. I did  
so, and entered upon a course of new and  
severe labor with my voice, in meetings  
and in conversation. From that time I  
have been substantially well, and have  
performed more hard labor with my  
tongue, in the last two years, than in any  
other two years of my life.

"The case of Mrs. Fanny Leonard is  
well known in this community. About  
a year ago, after the birth of a child, she  
began to decline. The symptoms of her  
disease were severe pain in her breast  
and side, and sinking weakness. She  
became worse, till her friends had little  
hope of her recovery. In March, of the  
present year, a general persuasion mani-  
fested itself in our Association, that she  
would be healed by the power of God.  
As that persuasion arose, she still sunk.  
At length, the crisis of faith and of her  
disease, came together. She received  
strength at the very time when our faith  
predicted it, and she received it by the laying  
on of hands. She has been visibly  
improving ever since, and is now a  
healthy woman.

"The case of Mrs. M. E. Cragin may  
be briefly referred to here. From the pe-  
riod of her sixteenth year till the past  
summer, she has been subject to frequent  
attacks of the 'sick headache.' The dis-  
ease increased upon her, till its visits were  
expected regularly, as often as once a  
week. Many attempts were made to  
subdue it by medicines, but nothing avail-  
ed. In May last, it became constant and  
terribly distressing. Death seemed inevi-  
table. We resisted the disease as a spiritual  
power, not by medicine, but by the  
faith and will of our hearts. *The devil  
was cast out of her stomach*, and she has  
not had an attack of the 'sick headache'  
since.

"John R. Miller has long been subject  
to severe attacks of headache. On one  
of these occasions, in the course of the  
last summer, I went into his room and  
found him on the bed, suffering dreadfully.  
I laid my hand on his head and told  
him to *shake off the devil*. He arose at  
once, perfectly free from pain, and has  
not been troubled with this disease since."

But the most remarkable instance  
of healing was affected in the case  
of a Mrs. Hall. Mr. N. pronounces

\* Mr. N. adds, however, in a note;  
'Some of the Perfectionists have lost  
small children—*five or six in all*, during  
nine years; but these cases do not proba-  
bly belong to the account, because we are  
speaking only of believers.'

it 'as unimpeachable as any of the miracles of the primitive church!' From her own account of her state her diseases were literally 'legion.' Dropsy, a serious affection of the spine, a liver complaint, breathing very difficult, night sweats, hectic fever, a dreadful cough, a terrible pressure on her brain, and total blindness, are comprised in the fearful catalogue. Mr. Noyes commenced experimenting upon her in animal magnetism, in consequence of which, as she says, she began to recover. Subsequently, she lost her confidence in him, married an infidel, sunk into unbelief, and her diseases returned with greater violence than ever, accompanied by 'ulceration of the kidneys.' But this defection from the faith was only temporary. Mr. N. was invited to visit her again, and did so; —the result of which we give in his own words.

"After Mrs. Hall returned to our fellowship, I began to have a strong impression that the first signal manifestation of healing power would be in her case. The fact that she had come under my care several years ago, and a cure had been commenced, which had been defeated for the time by evil powers, seemed a pledge of a complete work yet to come. Her connection with an infidel husband and an infidel father, made her case just such an one as we might suppose God would choose, if he wished to strike a death blow at unbelief. From the time when she invited me to visit her, I felt myself challenged to a public contest with death. I made up my mind not to go to her till I could go in the fullness of faith; and I had an assurance that my dealings with her, at this time would not be like those of the former trial, but altogether more swift and decisive.

"Mrs. Cragin's case was yet upon my hands. Her enemies, though often routed, yet persecuted her from time to time, and I found at last, that the traitor who let them in was a subtle spirit of unbelief. It became evident to me that a decisive and final victory over unbelief was essential to a permanent victory over disease of any kind, forasmuch as unbelief is the protecting cover of all subordinate powers of evil. It also became evident that I could not reasonably expect to carry victory over unbelief abroad, till I had obtained it at home. This then was the

burden that lay upon my heart, viz. I must lift Mrs. Cragin out of the grave of unbelief before I can hope to be able to raise Mrs. Hall. Under this burden I labored about a week. Faith was the subject of constant investigation in our meetings. On Monday (the 21st of June) the contest with unbelief came to its crisis, in the case of Mrs. Cragin. In the evening meeting she testified her assurance that Christ had saved her *for ever* from the unbelieving spirit. The next morning I saw that all was ready for a movement towards Mrs. Hall. Her sister was at my house and wished to be carried home. I and Mrs. Cragin went with her.

"The first half hour of our visit to Mrs. H. was spent in general discourse on the subject of faith. When I had finished what I had to say, I called on Mrs. Cragin to speak. She commenced but had not proceeded far, when she began to be pale and faint. I took her by the hand and supported her as *she sank into death*. I said to her several times, in a loud voice, 'Look at me.' She heard me not. Her eyes were open, but fixed and glassy, like a dead person's. I carried my head forward, till my eye was in range with the direction of hers. At that moment there was a glimmer of recognition in her eye. I smiled, and she replied by a smile. Immediately, the deadly spell passed away, and Mrs. C. emerged with *angelic life and beauty*. (!) This scene was afterward repeated in a milder way.

"When these transactions were finished, Mrs. C. and I placed ourselves in more immediate communication with Mrs. Hall, by taking hold of her hands. I perceived that the power of unbelief was broken. Mrs. Hall declared with emphasis that she felt 'something good' taking place in herself, while Mrs. Cragin was dying. Up to this time, I had no very definite idea of what was to be done for Mrs. H. The way seemed to be open for her release, but the circumstances in which I found myself were new, and I shrank from anything like over-boldness, or experimenting. I thought and spoke of returning home, and yet it seemed to me that she ought to go with me. On the whole, I could not leave her so.

"At length, as I walked the floor, meditating on new things, an omnipotent will began to infuse itself into my consciousness. I said in my heart, with the freedom which goes with the power of realization—'God shall have his own way in this matter.' Soon after this the way was naturally and easily opened for me to call her forth from her prison, and I did it with full consciousness of the co-operation and authority of God. After

she arose, and while the women were changing her clothes, I walked in another room, and there again felt an omnipotent will going forth from my heart, decreeing as from the throne of the universe, that she should go home with me, which she did."

Mrs. Hall adds,

"This event took place about two weeks ago. I have never doubted since that I was healed *instantaneously by the power of God*. I can honestly say, that whereas for eight years, I have been a miserable, bed-rid, half dead victim of disease, I am now well." —*Spiritual Magazine*, July, 1847.

Such, then, is Perfectionism;—not the half-way doctrine of Westleyanism or Oberlinism, but the system carried out to its full development, both in faith and practice. A glance at the sketch of it now given, will show it to be a curious mixture of almost all the speculative vagaries new and old which have in different ages been published to the world;—a sort of theological *olla podrida*, in which, besides some shreds of sense and truth, are mingled Materialism, Swedenborgianism, Manicheism, Antinomianism, Transcendentalism, Bushism, Fourierism, and 'come-outism,' stewed in the 'spiritual fluid' of Animal Magnetism, and served out by John H. Noyes in the commons of the Association in Putney, Vt. We have no marvel that they who are accustomed to feed on such fare, should, like the aforesaid Mrs. Cragin, be distressed with frequent attacks of 'sick headache,' and need more than once to have 'the devil cast out of their stomachs!'

We regret to have occupied so much space with a topic which may, perhaps, be regarded as unworthy of the notoriety we are giving it. Yet when we remember the career of Millerism and Mormonism, still so recent,—to say nothing of the early history of Perfectionism itself, in Connecticut,—we are compelled to own that nothing is insignificant, which affects the faith and conduct of mankind in the momentous con-

cerns of eternity. Nothing is too absurd to be believed by somebody, or, when sufficiently excited by fanaticism, to force its way like a moral tornado, through all our churches. And in view of the notoriety which the so-called sciences of phrenology and animal magnetism are obtaining at this day, we should not wonder if Perfectionism, of the sort before us, of which the latter is the very life and soul, should again break forth upon the churches with still greater resources of mischief, and more deplorable success than before.

It is not that we are in any measure inimical to the object, at which this and kindred systems profess to aim, that we thus speak. We say God speed to aught that will truly elevate the standard of piety among professing Christians. But it is because, in our view, all the tendencies of such a system as this are destructive of that end, that we would expose it. The human mind is prone to extremes. Disgusted and repelled by such a crude mixture of error and mysticism, and such extravagant pretensions in its advocates, men go as far the other way, and suppose that the *duty* of perfect holiness, is as much a chimera as its professed attainment. This is surely an evil, great and deplorable. In this age of the church, she can not afford any relaxation of motives, urging to the most eminent spiritual attainments. The providence of God in the world, her own internal wants, and the commands of Christ in his word, all join in urging her to a higher standard than she has ever hitherto reached. Without it, the day of the world's conversion must remain distant. Without it, the true power and excellence of Christianity can not be exemplified. Without it, irreligion and infidelity on the one hand, and error and fanaticism on the other, will never be vanquished. While then, our confession, with that of Paul, should ever be, in persistent

honesty, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect," we should still recognize its obligation and say, "But this one thing I do;—forgetting those things

which are behind and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

### RELIGIOUS TOLERATION.

It is only within these two or three hundred years that Religious Toleration has had any place among the wants or aims of the Christian world. The development of such a want—the rise and growth of such a doctrine—and the broader and more spiritual field in which it is yet to find application, are topics of the deepest religious and philosophical interest.

For many ages the current doctrine and practice had been, to adopt as a standard certain prevalent formulas of faith and worship, and to require, in the name of all power, spiritual and temporal, absolute and universal conformity to these, on peril of penalties in such case provided. Hence, the very names of that crime of holding any other than the established doctrine—*heterodoxy*, another opinion; *heresy*, always, a choice, of course a variation; as if to exercise a choice, when the truth is all ascertained and propounded by authority, were manifestly a crime! For is not the truth one? And are not men bound to receive and hold it, and not something else than it? An orthodoxy being established, any other doctrine is evidently a heterodoxy; a choice is a heresy, and can not be tolerated. God having made things and truths in a certain way, and all these being mapped out definitely by authority, even as He has established them, by what right shall any man depart from that? By what right shall any man be allowed to depart from that? Shall not all powers whatsoever concern them-

selves in this highest matter? For is it a thing of indifference whether a man hold the truth? Verily, it is of the greatest possible difference—for holding the truth, he shall be saved; not holding that, but choosing, he shall not be saved. Therefore, let church and state join hands to save all souls. Here is the truth: hold men to that, as you would hold them from perdition. If they choose they will differ; and if they differ, they will be damned.

This was the prevalent theory through the ages which constitute, in more than one sense, the middle passage of Roman Christianity. But it could not hold when the thick darkness was rolled off from the world. And even then it would not wholly yield, nor admit at once any considerable modification. It might be expected even to show its full deformity and put forth its worst workings, only when its quiet hold on the world should begin to be shaken. Till then it rested for the most part unprovoked, in the peaceful consciousness of being always, everywhere, and by all admitted. Accordingly the age of cruelty and blood, the era of the stake and the rack, is found intervening between the old reign of darkness deep enough to secure quiet uniformity, and the period of so much light as rendered diversity incurable by burning. While as yet the human mind was unemancipated, and thought had not yet begun to work on religion, it cost little expense of blood, little infliction of any kind to secure uniformity of faith and

worship. Now and then a Witch or Wicca must be crushed ; but one example sufficed for an age to quell all heresies, all choosings. But when the flood of light poured over the world in the 16th century, light in some such measure as to match the copious darkness, then came the struggle. The strong man armed kept the house, and the stronger strove to enter. The demon must needs rend his victim in the leaving. Hence it is in the transition period that we find the full fruits of the ancient doctrine in the horrors of persecution.

And in this was given one of the most needful and salutary lessons of the Reformation. Somewhere in the times we needed a demonstration of the real purport and capabilities of the no-toleration doctrine, the besetting vice of all religions ; and the martyr-age of the Reformation gave it, so that it will be ever memorable to the world. By that very demonstration, in part, it has become impossible, we may hope, ever again to establish in its fullness a doctrine so odious and malignant.

This transition period is marked by another curious feature. The light seems to have been, for a long time, almost solely objective in its operation. It shone on things, and not in men. It revealed more clearly than ever before what ought to be believed—what was truth, what error ; but it slowly penetrated the souls of men, to enlighten them as to the nature of religious belief and the rights of conscience. Accordingly the sons of light go forth in the great battle of the Reformation with the same weapons, for a time, with the children of darkness. They, too, will make men hold the truth—with them, too, no choosings shall be allowed—no heresies. The great difference, too long, was only this : The things, nine and thirty in number, more or less, which Protestants would force upon the consciences of men, were by God's favor, not

far from truths—and the others would force men to believe even a greater number of lies. No spiritual franchise was yet anywhere recognized. The right to inquire, examine, prove anything and then reject or believe—the right to choose at all what a man would believe, and how he would embody his belief in worship to God—was long equally an offense to Papist and Protestant.

Thus far, no approach had been made, or as yet seemed probable, toward freedom in religion. Absolutism was simply passing from Romish into Protestant hands, modified, but in no essential changed. In England, mere state-churchism was apparently coming forth as the only product of the Reformation. Had this been all, the world would indeed have gained something ; but the idea of religious freedom would have found no development. The Protestant state-church, which was the first result of the struggle, insisted still on the right and the power to enforce religious uniformity, and was not a whit behind the old school in which it was bred, in denouncing private judgment and individual choice in religion—equally claiming with Romanism itself, a sovereign authority over all consciences, an absolute dictatorship in all matters of faith and forms. And such the church of England remains to this day in its theory—happily impotent to realize that theory, and able to do after its kind only far enough to serve the new ages with a live specimen of the old spirit—like some polar monster drifting far down into softer latitudes on a field of ice, cold to the last, yet melting as it goes.

But how different had this been, if no third element had had place in the great experiment ! Such an element God did not suffer to be wanting. Almost simultaneously with the birth of English Protestantism, Puritanism appeared ; and the ma-

my priceless blessings which have accrued to the world from that great struggle, have mainly been wrought out by this element. And by far the richest boon of the Reformation to later times, is, if we esteem things rightly, this doctrine of the rights of conscience—of spiritual allegiance to the truth only, and only as truth—of freedom in religious inquiry, belief, and worship. This was the gem found at the bottom of the crucible, when the fires were at last quenched and the seething elements had subsided into peace. And for these the world is indebted to the Puritans of that and the following age.

Even they did not at first see both sides of this doctrine. For a long time the toleration aspect of it was hidden from them, or faintly described, even after they had asserted for themselves the supremacy of conscience, and practiced the right of dissent. In all the first stages of its history, Puritanism was pressed rather to the assertion and defense of its invaded rights, than to the consideration of contingent duties. But the discovery of the one ensured that of the other. Their non-conformity necessitated the development of toleration. But its development and annunciation were all that age could produce. It was embraced by no considerable party of that period. It had dawned on many Puritan minds; but its first signal declaration and effective advocacy before the world were reserved for such men as Eliot and Vane and Cromwell—men whose highest honor it will yet be counted, that they discerned and boldly uttered, what had all along from the first been the drift and purport of Puritanism, that in matters of faith the conscience had no master but God.

But in this they outstript the age. England was not yet ripe for the reception of this doctrine. The temper of all the great religious parties was undiagnosed—tolerant of

anything more than of toleration. The churchmen hated it worse than they hated the kirk—the Presbyterians worse than they hated the liturgy. In the Westminster Assembly it found advocates only among the Independents, and was bitterly denounced from every other quarter. “Toleration!” cried one of the members, “it will make the kingdom a chaos, a Babel, another Amsterdam, a Sodom, an Egypt, a Babylon: Toleration is the grand work of the devil, his master-piece and chief engine to uphold his tottering kingdom. As original sin is the fundamental sin, having the seed and spawn of all sin in it, so toleration hath all errors in it, and all evils.” That venerable body was occupying a position such as no other ever occupied. It had for its work to organize the religion of England—to give it something in place of the prelacy that had been uprooted. In this spirit they were doing that work, and Presbyterian state-churchism, instead of Episcopal, was the best it could find the heart to offer—absolutism under this form, instead of that! Evidently there must be more Stuarts in England. There was need of a Restoration, and “healing declarations,” and Savoy Conferences issuing in another Bartholomew’s Day—need of campaignings by Jeffrys, and dragoonings by Claverhouse, and all too little to complete the discipline of England by evil unto good. It is not yet completed. It was the vocation of that stormy age only to work out and heave to the surface the doctrine of toleration; not to reap its blessings, but to cast it forth as bread on the waters, to be found after many days.

Yet in this progress of things the doctrine of intolerance became necessarily modified. There was not more tolerance; there was the same wish and effort to enforce on all consciences the faith once delivered by law. But there was a great change

going forward during this whole period, in respect to the means deemed available to this end. Happily, the taste of the age had lost its relish for fire as the test of orthodoxy. The "turn or burn" decree could no longer go forth. Persecution must abate its savagery, and mingle discretion with its madness. Yet as we look back over that whole eventful century and a half, from the Reformation to the Revolution, and compare the methods of persecution which successively prevailed, we scarce know which to prefer, the horrible rigor of the Tudors, that sent its hundreds to the flames, or the equal bigotry of the Stuarts, which reached with modified terrors as many thousands through the nation—that never tired of the detail of cruelty—that threw into jeopardy all but the life of every man who chose in religion, and hunted its crowds to the prisons, or hurried them out of the land.

Since the period of the Commonwealth, a new power has wrought to modify still farther the methods by which uniformity of faith shall be enforced. The doctrine of toleration had now found utterance in England too—and though never espoused, though abjured to this hour in that country in any but a partial and mutilated form of it, it has nevertheless been there as a presence and a power ever since. "Small by degrees and beautifully less," is the history of persecution for the last three centuries, certainly in respect to its popularity and the severity of its measures. But the decline is more rapid from the time of the Commonwealth. The new element then took effect. Charles II. could return to defend the faith by betraying all who trusted him, reversing all that liberty had gained, and heaping indecent abuse on the dead Protector and his compeers—thus doing into English what is written, that "a living dog is better than a dead lion;" but

he could no longer persecute like his father, still less like his grandfather, least of all like the Tudors. He had a new force to contend with, which he could neither understand nor resist, and which was henceforth destined to baffle every scheme of enforced uniformity. The unremitting attempt for more than a century to crush down every aspiration after civil or religious liberty, had been as so many incantations, and had sufficed to raise at last a spirit that would not down. Almost as an involuntary groan, the crushed heart of England had at last uttered the doctrine of the right of all men to freedom and protection in all purely religious matters. From that day a new restraint is apparent on every attempt to employ the old enginey of ecclesiastical despotism. There was persecution still, as there yet is; but it was rapidly becoming possible only by a negative plan—by the privative process of denying rights and curtailing privileges—by the invention of disabilities, and evading test-oaths, instead of open and direct inflictions. A little later we begin to find bills of comprehension and acts of toleration discussed in parliament, very imperfect in kind, and still more in their issue; and yet they testify that a new thought was at work in England—that a new principle was finding its way toward ultimate prevalence. It has thus far had progress, but not victory. For the last fifty years, the new tendency toward free religion has accomplished not a little in outward and visible results; and shadows are thrown up of events yet to rise, certifying us of a greater than all visible changes in the thoughts and intents of English hearts.

It is a deeply interesting problem now in process of solution in the British Isles, and it has significance for other lands and for all coming time: What—with a church, on

the one hand, allied to the state, embedded changelessly in the forms and modes of the sixteenth century, absolutism the law of its being, never having for a moment forgotten itself so far as to adopt the principle of toleration, but simply sunk its constraints from the exterminating to the exasperating point—with a population, on the other hand, more than half dissenters, annoyed, disqualified, and alienated by an intolerance that persecutes as it can, and is perpetually grasping the sword it dare not draw—with a question of Ireland, and of the Catholic claims still pressing for settlement, and full of the elements of dissension and peril—what is England about to do with all this? It looks like the fifth act of the English reformation.

In our own country little remains to be wished for on the score of freedom from civil constraints in religion. In the very earliest period of our history, toleration was, for a time, no better understood here than in England; but we far sooner and more perfectly cleared ourselves of the evil.

We have thus far contemplated toleration in the common acceptation of the term, meaning by it freedom and protection to every man in forming, practicing, and propagating his religious faith, secure from all let or molestation, so long as he observes the rights of others. Such freedom is one of the greatest blessings enjoyed in our country. We have only to look back on the past, or around on other lands, to find affecting proofs of the greatness of our privilege in this respect. Looking at the thing in itself, and especially in the light thrown on it by modern views of the rights and responsibility of conscience, nothing, we know, can be more self-evident than that no man has a right to coerce another in matters of faith. In this view, it is even an impertinence for one

man, or body of men, to talk of tolerating another's religious sentiments. Forsooth, he'll bear with my believing so, will he! He'll put up with my convictions! In his forbearance, he'll keep his hands off me for frequenting the mass and praying to the virgin! He'll endure that I exercise my own judgment and conscience, and will patiently tolerate opposite conclusions from his own! Let the man, all men, all bodies of men, all states and all churches, know their place and keep it. There is a vicious implication in the term itself, as if the conscience were in some sort amenable to men, and they might take upon them graciously to license its action, or pardon its delinquencies, and receive grateful acknowledgments for the same. And yet, as the world has been, and still is, we will be thankful for toleration.

But this is only the gross and outward view. There is a toleration more interior and spiritual. Let us trace it within the pale of admitted piety, and inquire what scope it finds, what obligations it imposes on Christians differing among themselves in the views and practice of religion.

Wherever religious freedom exists, there diversity of religious views will be found. Unanimity and uniformity are possible in such matters only when darkness and despotism completely enthral the minds of men. We have to choose, therefore, between such a condition of things as renders intelligent faith an impossibility, and such a condition, on the other hand, as renders diversity inevitable.

Neither ought such diversity to be regarded as of course, and in its own nature, so great an evil. At first view it seems painful and lamentable that men should differ on subjects of such vital concern as those of religion; and incidentally great evils do attach themselves to this diversity of minds.

But these evils, which thus result from spiritual freedom and activity, are, at their worst, more than counterbalanced by benefits from the same source.

But in order that this inevitable diversity may not prove an inevitable source of distrust, division, and bitterness, it becomes a necessity that we be of a generous and tolerant spirit. It is our only salvation. And this is one, perhaps the highest virtue that is to find culture in this school. We must have toleration—not by any means merely in the gross sense of not laying hands on those who dissent from us, but in the infinitely higher sense of a catholic spirit among all the good, the spirit of unity in the midst of diversity, of fraternal acceptance among dissentient Christians. We can not entirely agree in our religious opinions. Searching diligently and prayerfully after truth, with an equal though imperfect desire and love of it, we come to very different conclusions. Within a certain very limited compass, we do agree; some few greatest truths we in common accept and hold. But these are often as an island in an ocean of diversities. Debatable questions encompass us on every hand. Two men, loving truth, able to think, and actually thinking for themselves with vigor and earnestness, ranging thus over the whole field of religious inquiry—including truths, modes of truth, relations, statements, justifications and philosophies of truth—will probably as often differ as agree. And these disagreements may not always be limited to indifferent and trivial points. It is a very difficult and delicate matter, after all, to run that line of which we so often hear as something plain and well known—the line, namely, between essential and non-essential truths—between the matters which Christians must agree in holding, and those in which they may differ. For such a line of de-

marcation is to include the good; all the genuinely good; and no straight line will include them; for character refuses to follow the lines of theological systems with absolute accuracy. Good heretics are, alas! as possible as orthodox sinners. Figure for a moment a congress of the good yet in the flesh, all heartily loving the truth with an obedient spirit; and how large is the number of truths that can be stated in human language, for which you can carry a unanimous vote among them? What doctrine will you propound, in terms so unexceptionable, that no considerable section of those having in them the soul of goodness, will file off in the negative? Some such truths, in some mode of statement, are held by all; but, stated in the loosest generalities, the number is not very large. These diversities are attributable to a great variety of causes; but account for them as you will, their actual existence among genuinely good men, on almost every conceivable question of a religious nature, is undeniable. Charity must have a place here, and may well cover speculative crudities as well as sins.

It follows that doctrinal tests of goodness must often prove imperfect, fallacious, and unjust. You can not discern a good man by simply measuring him with a creed. Goodness dwells in many souls, to whom any thirty-nine articles are full of incredibilities—to whom the Calvinistic pentagon is very horrible, and whom neither your creed nor any creed can contain. For character does not consist wholly or chiefly in a man's speculative views. It lies deeper than any system of opinions. And if we are to do any justice to men, if we are to estimate one another at all rightly in this world, we must bear in mind that goodness is quite distinguishable from systematic orthodoxy, quite compatible with some sorts and degrees of heterodoxy. The love of God and of man

—the honest heart toward truth and duty—the obedient spirit—in a word, that right-heartedness which all would pronounce pleasing to God, is to be found in men denying, one after another, points, that to us seem clear and indispensable. It is very inconsistent in them, but still many great errorists escape perdition.

Now the first working of a truly tolerant spirit will be to recognize and *fellowship* goodness wherever found. It will teach us to look beyond speculations to the spirit, and to perceive and love substantial piety, dwell where it may. Often it will call on us to honor real goodness only the more highly, for the environment of hostile errors and prejudices and false theology in which it has had strength to live. Honor and love the good. Even when they follow not with us, seek to know them and to understand them. Go over to them, if you can, so far as to look at things from their point of view. Very much will thus be explained to you. They may be found to have not only errors which you have not, but truths also. At least you will see, if you look diligently, how they came to be as they are—how these errors presented themselves acceptably to their minds—how they are neutralized by truths—how even what you have deemed their errors, it may be are no errors, but truths which you lack.

Reason as you will that the denial of a certain truth implies a bad heart, we shall often be compelled to admit that the implication does not hold—that, in spite of the logical tendencies of an error, the heart sets logic at defiance, and retains its integrity along with the error. Tracing out implications and relying upon them, the Calvinist will settle it that, clearly as election and its kindred doctrines are revealed, the rejection of these must imply a wrong heart. And as clearly his Arminian neighbor finds, that these fatal doctrines can not be held with-

out involving ruinous arrogance and presumption. Each discovers a philosophical ground of certainty that the doctrine he opposes, if suffered to put forth its legitimate influence and assert its affinities, must materially affect the very foundations of character. For does not the man hold *this*? and *this* holds him to *that*—and *that* implies a third—and so onward, still more and more astray, till a point is reached that leaves no hope for him. Most true, if *all this*—but he holds that first, and even the second, but there he stubbornly refuses to follow the track of your logical necessity another step—blindly denies that the track leads that way—and inconsistently, at the sacrifice of all claims to metaphysical rectitude, he bolts aside from the precipice which you see before him, and clammers into the kingdom.

And what is true of multitudes who embrace systems of some error with much truth, namely, that they are good and salvable men, and deserve our acceptance as such notwithstanding their errors, is true also of fewer, doubtless, and yet not a few, whose systems are composed of some truth with much error. We make here the amplest admission of the intrinsic hostility of error to goodness. The influence of false doctrine is always to be suspected. A man's errors are so many indications against him, and demand a cautious estimate of his character. But we maintain that they are not decisive, and that Christian justice requires us to look beyond these, and weigh with a glad and liberal spirit every token that the heart has escaped the infection. Not seldom we might find the Unitarian so far resisting the tendencies of his system, as to bring himself really within the effect of that atonement which in speculation he denies. Say that the strict idea of the divine unity, excluding a second divine and expiating person, and a

third distinct renewing and sanctifying person, strikes by direct consequence at all just views of God's character and of man's, and of their relations to each other. Held thus to the strict and full implications of his system, no Unitarian can be saved. But admit that a man may hold in spirit and essence what in theory he rejects—admit the unconscious influence of a better faith stealing in upon man's soul even while they are contending against it—and there is room left for the hope and the belief, that there are hearts renewed by that Spirit and washed in the blood of that Savior, whom their system refuses to recognize. Even under a corruption like that of the Papal system, so pervading and fundamental that the body of its adherents scarcely deserves the title of a Christian church, there have yet been, we trust, in every age, no small number of devout and spiritual minds, retired and silent, looking through corrupt symbols to the truth, and numbered of God in his own true church of the good.

Especially will this spirit of Christian consideration, for which we need a better name than toleration, prompt us to a very critical and candid inquiry, how far the errors found in any case in connection with piety are the result of certain foregone causes, to be detected in hereditary prejudices, in an early one-sided nurture, and in speculative conclusions anterior to conversion. How powerful the influences are, and how far deserving of blame, which these causes exert on the whole after-faith and after-life, let any man learn by an inspection of the inside of his own history. Let almost any one sit down to the study of himself in this particular, and sift out from the whole mass of his tenets those, for example, which he unconsciously imbibed before he could reason—those which he afterwards took on sympathetically before he did reason—those which authority has all

along been giving him without his reasons—all but those which he, by right of investigation and conviction, has made his own; and as he looks at the residuum, let him learn to think with considerate charity of the notions of his brethren. The case with nearly every man is, that, at the point of time when he begins a Christian life, he has already become a bundle of prejudices, sympathies, and notions about religion, crude, undigested, uninvestigated; and with all these deeply wrought into his being, he enters on his real religious life. Little as his heart has hitherto been concerned, he has nevertheless got together a theology, a theory of speculative religion. His soul is regenerated with its creed already on—a vague aggregate, for the most part, of the opinions that have been current around him. What he shall be speculatively hereafter—what species of Christian he shall be, now that he is come to be of the Christian genus, is not often now to be decided. That is a foregone conclusion. His father's faith is in him, or the faith of the sect in which he was bred. Exceptions occur, indeed, caused by some special alternative circumstances attending conversion. Then it is to be considered, too, how little regeneration itself has to do, in any direct way, in refashioning the opinions. The regeneration is of the heart, not of the head. The man's creed is not born again, nor his understanding. Grace simply takes him up with all his prejudices as they are, and henceforth works in him among these prejudices, over them, and against them, and does with him the best it can. In time it may be found to have effected some change in his theology, sometimes a very great change, but ordinarily very little. Some views he has gradually modified—some new views he has accepted—many of his former persuasions he has now thought out, in his way, till they have risen into con-

victions and become his own. But grace working back through the heart into the understanding, and prevailing on the man actually to throw up a hereditary tenet or a denominational dogma, is wonderful grace, to say the least of it. Sectarian nurture works almost as indelibly as original sin. Bred a Baptist, the man and his sons and his sons' sons will retain a partiality for immersion to the last. And the same thing in kind holds true of other sectarian peculiarities. We suspect that among the adherents of the several denominations of Christians, nine of ten are where they are from prejudices thus imbibed. They went there of course. Not a little partisanship was concerned in it, too, and is yet concerned. It goes by propagation what a man shall be, for the great part—with only occasional apostasy. Not only have they not sought out and set in order their own independent views, with patient investigation, resulting in earnest, intelligent conviction, but their human nature and previous training has disqualifed them for it. They must remain, for the most part, what they have already become. You must tolerate them—rather you must love them for the good that is in them, and tolerate all the rest. If you cannot love the hard, rough denominational shell that encases and mars them, you must nevertheless discern the kernel from the shell. Do justice to your brother, considering thyself also—for he, doubtless, with his history, is as little to be blamed for being what he is, as you with your history are to be commended for being what you are.

So deep is the impression of religious opinions early imbibed, that it is rarely, if ever, effaced in later life. Proselytes from one creed to another are seldom completely converted. There are transpositions of this kind, giving men new names and new relations; but the old views

have generally possessed them too thoroughly ever to be wholly cast out. In proportion to the significance of a tenet which early gains acceptance with the mind, and according to the degree of intelligent conviction or partisan affection with which the man embraces it, will be the depth of the impression it makes on him, and the practical hold it will retain on the soul in spite of all subsequent changes. The mark of every considerable early opinion will remain in him to the last. For it wrought on the spirit at the most impressible period, and cleaves to it only the more closely because it wedded itself to the affections rather than the reason. The after-faith which may be engrrafted will, perhaps, go far to correct the original quality, but its sap is still there, and may often be detected even in the fruit.

Hence it comes that proselytes denominationally are so often no great gain to the winning party. If you regard any thing but numbers, they are rather a nominal than a substantial acquisition. The new tenet that is taken on, is apt to hang loosely about them, like a heterogeneous patch, with seams visible and provoking the eye. It will not entirely coalesce with the old remnant. The proselyte needs continual fore-thought to sustain his new character and conform himself to his position; and though he may have it worse than in the natural way, yet his driving, like that of the son of Niimshi, only proclaims, 'Lo! I am a neophyte—come see my zeal in this new way!' And after all, his soul is but amphibious. He is in spirit an Arminian still, though he comes out Calvinistically. He thinks in his mother-creed, and translates in the new tongue.

And so it is in more fundamental matters of faith. The original belief, the doctrine in which one was nurtured, and which grew up with him through all the ductile period of

his life, will be found to have penetrated and impregnated his being beyond complete recovery. His utmost efforts do not expel it. His victories over it are only partial. He can not wholly believe in opposition to it. A man may so far escape from his early misbeliefs and malpractices, as to have become a new man in Christ, and yet the old habit may haunt him, and show itself here and there in some incongruous development—incongruous and scandalous enough to others, but not to his apprehension. The converted sailor swears in his prayers. The converted Romanist crosses himself unconsciously at sight of a crucifix. Peter can not eat with the unclean. The taint of Gnosticism creeps down for centuries through its converted children, and leavens the Christianity of the age. Luther sticks fast in the real presence, and can never wholly protest against his early errors. The disciple from Unitarianism may have come to believe savingly in Christ, and yet feel an indomitable aversion to the doctrines of total depravity, and never in his life attain to believe in a personal Satan. The converted infidel struggles to the end with the recurring skepticism that has become ingrained in his mind. Thus, in a multitude of instances, we have the Christian substance with various accidents—real piety, modified and distorted by the force of foregone opinions. Painful as these deficiencies and redundancies are, we may still have the most undeniable proofs of a holy heart at the bottom. Now to receive such abnormal Christians aright, is one of the highest achievements of genuine Christianity. Not with any favor or sanction of their errors, but notwithstanding these impertinences, let us receive them on the higher ground of their evident goodness and acceptance with God.

The same kind of diversities often result from original peculiarities of

temperament and mental structure. These exercise great influence in shaping the creeds of men, and are a fruitful source of variety in religious opinions and convictions. Were there no other causes at work, this would forbid unanimity, and create ample occasion for the exercise of a tolerant spirit. How often, within the same denominational lines, do men find themselves impelled to the most irreconcilable diversities in their theory and practice of religion. Their minds are so variously toned—the practical tendency so predominates in one, and the metaphysical in another—the rigid in this one, and the liberal in that—that differences often arise between brethren assenting to the same articles more serious in their tendency, more considerable in their real import, than the same persons would find between themselves and many of a widely different name. And the wonder is, with the theory of denominational subdivision as the only method of keeping the Christian peace, that we have not more denominations than we have.

We know how difficult it is to speak to any purpose, and even to speak discreetly to no purpose, on this complicated topic of the denominational arrangement of the Christian world. We would willingly decline it. But Christian tolerance has much to do with it. And with a subject so constantly running us upon this unwelcome point, deeply feeling, too, that this arrangement is radically vicious, and that the current views are fitted only to perpetuate it, we may be excused for deliberately exercising the worse part of valor, and speaking directly of what so hovers around us.

Let us disclaim at once, however, all confidence in direct attempts to effect a union of the sects. Any such amalgamation, as the result of conceded or suppressed convictions, would be as useless as it is impre-

ticable. We cherish no hope from that method, nor desire any union that comes only of the will. And yet we do not believe the case is forever remediless, but cherish the anticipation of an ultimate recovery of the Christian world from its present arrangement.

This arrangement by denominational division, if we conceive of it rightly, is simply a substitute for Christian tolerance. It was adopted and should be retained, only as a less evil than the more disjunctive disjunction of Christians who can not agree, and will not tolerate one another in diversity. The principle on which it proceeds is that of grouping together the unanimous, precluding diversity. The process of reasoning seems to be this: Christians who can not agree in holding such and such points of faith, good though they are and admitting one another's goodness, can not dwell together in peace; they will not bear with one another in their peculiar views; they must separate: those, on the other hand, who agree in certain doctrines and methods, can probably maintain harmony together; let such embody those tenets in a creed, or collection of test-points, with which to sift out, and exclude from that group, all such as from their dissent are presumed, though Christians, to be intolerable to those within, and likely to break the peace if admitted. Now it is not our purpose to deny the need, as things have been and yet are, of such an expedient. Only let it be regarded as an expedient which it is even a shame that we should need; for it has its place only when charity fails. To justify it at all, we must admit a great and prevalent defect of Christian spirit. Assuming that as Christians we either can not, or actually will not, receive and treat one another with candor, forbearance and hearty fraternal cordiality, notwithstanding all and any peculiarities of faith and specu-

lative disagreements, not attended with a bad heart—assuming that we can not or will not rise above such speculative diversities, and find in a holy character, in a common relation and resemblance to Christ, a point of union and coalescence, not to be essentially disturbed by circumstantial varieties—then indeed the best thing is to keep away from one another; and let the division be carried on till we are sorted into groups numerous enough and small enough to secure the necessary degree of unanimity.

But if we mistake not, our separations are not generally viewed in this light. Instead of a coarse temporary expedient to supply mechanically the lack of tolerance and love, needful only to the immature, they are rather regarded as presenting the normal condition and necessary arrangement of Christians in the flesh, above which no maturity in grace can raise us. We do not believe in any such inherent necessity of sects. With a quite attainable measure of gracious and considerate enlargement of mind among Christians, the necessity would disappear.

Let us consider this point. Here are some half dozen denominations of Christians. Why should they be separated thus? Is it that they may cluster together according to their views and sympathies, and have intercourse with comfort and edification among those of like mind and kindred spirit? But it is not among the demands of the largest Christian liberality that we should forego or violate these affinities, nor that we should concede a single conviction. Suppose them, now, with the same opinions and preferences, but with a larger charity and a judgment more enlightened, to find themselves in the same community with no denominational lines among them. Would not the laws of spiritual attraction provide for us even better than now? For those

are now often separated by a denominational hedge, who if left to their affinities, would flow toward each other with a stronger sympathy than they feel for many in their own artificial group. Within every denomination men do now consult their tastes, and have their intimacies with the congenial. Why not rely on the same law to effect a sufficient distribution in one only denomination—that of the good? And these natural groups would not have in them the nature, nor be subject to the laws, of sects. We now set off and organize the adherents of peculiar tenets by themselves, on the ground that, if not thus separated, they would drive a partisan and proselytizing work, and so come in collision to the wreck of all harmony. But we create the aggressive spirit in this very way. At least this remedy exasperates what would otherwise be mild and tolerable. For we have now so many organized parties, impelled by the law of their being to rivalry and propaganda. The great motive and provocation to partisan movements is begotten by the scheme of separation. The incentive to proselytism is that we are of a party. That a man is a Christian is not enough—not more than half enough—we want him on our side of the lines, to gather with us. And the partisan spirit finds free passage; for the lines that sever us effectually from Christian intimacy, are no bars in its way. With no organized parties, men would soon tire of laboring at transpositions in the same field.

But is there, then, no important difference between one set of tenets and another? Are we, in our liberality, to endorse all things and prefer nothing—as if Methodist views, for instance, were as good as *our* views, and their ways as our ways, and it were no matter what men hold? No, truly—there is a difference in doctrines and in methods, one set much better than an-

other. But a little reflection might show that this does not justify, but altogether condemn, our organized separations. In the first place, the removal of all these partitions would imply no more indifference to truth, no more sanction of the less excellent views, than may be now charged upon us. For with these same partial and defective views upon them, only the more partial and extreme by disjunction, we own them as Christians. All that we do is to set them off by themselves, as Christians of a particular species. That is to say, our recognition of them as Christians while holding their peculiarities in organized sects, involves just as much indifference about tenets, as would our union with them holding the same in one body. Then, again, for the very reason that there is an important difference in views and modes, let them not be thrown into repulsion and extremity by a system of antagonisms. Mountains make enemies of nations. Our partisan attitude has touched us all with fanaticism. Our peculiarities are invested with a factious importance. Perspective is lost, and all is distorted. What is *ours* becomes great and vital, and all beyond is to be pitied, deplored, and withheld. Break down these walls of separation, and things would return to their shapes. These peculiar views would stand to one another in an entirely different relation, and would ultimately find their level. Christians of variant views, but not of different parties, could then approach one another on all points, and, being for once mutually understood, would find themselves no longer separable. It is the suspicion of a partisan purpose that now poisons all such approaches. Holding then still, as we ought, our perfect allegiance to truth, with a just disapproval of all error, where is the intrinsic necessity of separation among those admitting one another

to be Christians? With only a Catholic spirit, why may they not with great advantage dwell together, as one family in Christ, in such relations that they may approach and confer, and modify and rectify among themselves, trusting the better views to their better merits?

Episcopacy boasts that it has differences without divisions. With all the material for vastly more sects than are found in the dissenting world, she has no *sects*. From Laud to Baxter, from Pusey to Whateley, there is room and welcome for all things but non-conformity. Such power is there even in a form, when duly fostered. Now substitute among Christians, for any such outward point of union, one that is inward and vital—enthrone evangelical goodness as alone indispensable, and let grace be the solvent of all minor diversities—and why may not the children of the spirit dwell together in virtue of their spiritual oneness, with the infinitely higher tolerance of love, as well as the children of form on the strength of a form?

It pleases many to discourse of the present fragmentary condition of the Christian world as being, after all, very well as it is. We hope it is only from a secret despair of anything better, and with the amiable wish to reconcile themselves and others to what they deem a remediless evil, that so many labor to extenuate its mischiefs, and even praise the whole arrangement. Many ingenious euphemisms have been sought out for this purpose, and are doing much to content men with things as they are. But no figures can disguise the fact, that the effective force of the Christian religion is greatly diminished by these separations. It is needless to depict the workings of the system; but at least, let us not hear it commended. We may be compelled to submit to it as a necessity among such Christians as we are; but let us blush for

the necessity, and hasten its removal.

It may be but a dream that such a catholic Christian body, as we have been supposing, is possible on earth—that such a degree of tolerance can ever be attained among Christians in the flesh, as would be requisite to such a body. Certainly no sanguine expectations of its speedy realization are authorized by the present attitude and spirit of the churches. Sectarianism has in it a self-perpetuating power. Once parcel off Christians into parties, with their several peculiarities stereotyped in denominational creeds, and the whole tendency is to wider and deeper mischief. At once these peculiarities acquire an unnatural importance; jealousy forbids the approach to one another in frank, unpartisan discussion; the like-minded are set off together in unhealthy isolation to brood over their nest-egg, and nurse their zeal; predatory incursions are made in all directions to carry off Christians over certain lines; the *sect* spirit is instilled into the children, and shows its first workings on the play-ground, and thus, one generation moulding another in its own likeness, the evil seems interminable. And yet we do not despair of the future. There are hopeful indications, at least of a growing dissatisfaction among good men with the present divided state. Among these indications is the late Evangelical Alliance, or the effort at such an Alliance, if that be all we have attained. Many such failures may lie between us and the future church catholic of the good. We may all leave our bones in the wilderness. Yet we are persuaded there is coming a day of completer unity to the Christian church, a day of long-deferred beauty and prevalence, when Christians shall no longer be ruled by their diversities, but builded together in Christ on the broad identity of evangelical goodness. It will, per-

haps, then be found that this denominational era, this sect-age, was not without its uses as a period of tuition and trial, preparing the way, it may be, in more ways than we see, for the better things that shall come

after; a period in which, as on Mount Lebanon, the cedars are hewn, that shall enter without sound of hammer into a temple whither all the tribes shall go up.

---

### THE RELATION OF EDUCATION TO THE WELL-BEING OF STATES.\*

We know of no public documents more deserving the attention of wise and philanthropic men, than the Annual Reports of the Massachusetts Board of Education. They contain statistics upon the subject of education which it is important for every citizen to know; and set forth the bearing of systems of public instruction upon individual, social and national welfare in the clearest and most impressive manner. As mere literary productions, the Reports of the Secretary deserve the highest praise. His powerful arguments, his incontrovertible logic, his strong appeals in behalf of the cause of primary education, he clothes in the most appropriate and beautiful language. His diction borders on the poetical. He thinks in figures as Pope thought in rhyme. Yet the imagery with which his exuberant fancy supplies him, is chastened by a highly cultivated taste, so that he constantly pleases and never offends.

His Reports, from year to year, bring prominently to view some new aspect of the great cause of education. That before us shows, by the most conclusive evidence of which the nature of the case admits, that the school system of Massachusetts, without any change in its fundamental principles, may be so improved as greatly to diminish the

vice, crime and waste, and greatly increase the virtue and prosperity of the state; and demonstrates the pecuniary ability of the state to make such improvement. In the course of our remarks we shall have occasion to refer to the kind of testimony brought forward in the argument, and show its application to other states as well as Massachusetts. For the present we proceed to offer a few thoughts upon the main subject suggested by this Report:—The relation of education to the well-being of states.

Cause and effect are scarcely more closely connected in the natural than in the moral world. As a general fact, it is as true, that a right education for an entire generation of children and youth will result in public happiness and prosperity, as that the right cultivation of a piece of land will result in good crops. In both cases, the amount of success will correspond with the thoroughness and efficiency of the means. We have good authority to believe, that a generation of children, no less than a single child, if trained in the way they should go, will not depart from it. The power of early education to shape the future character and destiny of individuals and nations, has been understood from the earliest ages. History has preserved the systems of training adopted by several ancient nations, and we can discover in them a wise adaptation of the means to the ends which they had

---

\* Eleventh Annual Report of the Massachusetts Board of Education, together with the Eleventh Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board.

in view. That of Sparta was one of the most efficient ever adopted. The state regarded martial prowess and glory as the great object of ambition, and sacrificed for this end domestic and social happiness, wealth, commerce, learning, and every other interest. All the male children were taken at the age of eight from their parents, supported at public expense, and trained to be expert, bold and invincible in the use of arms. The state educated them to be soldiers, and was not disappointed. The valor and self-sacrifice of Leonidas, and his little band of heroes at Thermopylae, were the natural product of this training, as natural as any vegetable growth from the seed and toil of the husbandman.

Modern nations have adopted systems of education differing in character, according to the reigning ideas of the people. But all aim to repeat themselves in their posterity by some kind of educational institutions. Whether the mass of the people shall be educated or not, and what shall be the kind of education imparted, depends upon the object which the leading minds of the nation have in view. The early colonies of New England opened the fountains of knowledge to all. The first system of free schools in the history of our race was adopted on these western shores. It was a new measure, a most radical step, an innovation beyond all former innovations. Our fathers reasoned—and nobody now questions the soundness of their logic—that if all were trained aright, intellectually and morally, the people would be able to take care of themselves, and save the enormous bill it had always cost the world to be civilly and ecclesiastically governed. They denied that God created a few men with better blood in their veins, on purpose to be the monopolists of all the wealth, and learning, and power of the world. And they acted consistently. The success of

their experiment shows their wisdom. Public schools are esteemed among us as necessities of life, and New England men carry them wherever they go in their migrations: so that they are established, with various modifications, in all the northern and western states of the Union.

Look now at the result of the general education of the people in those states where the school system has been in operation for the longest period? You behold a degree of order, thrift, enterprise, wealth, virtue, and general comfort and happiness, unequaled in any country where the like cause has not been operating. In Massachusetts and Connecticut this cause has been at work for two hundred years; and although we can not say precisely what proportion of influence is to be attributed to the public schools of these states, and what to other influences which have tended to the same results, yet wise men never hesitate to assign them a prominent place among the causes which have made these states so prosperous. The great mass of the people have been so educated in these schools, have acquired such an amount of knowledge, and been subjected to such mental and moral discipline, that their skill and efficiency in all kinds of productive labor, and the facility with which they turn their hands to all sorts of business, are mentioned to their credit throughout the world. They have thus been qualified, beyond any other nation, to be a self-supporting and self-governing people. Whence the contrast between them in respect to character and condition and those states and nations which have no similar system of public education? Whence their wealth? Not the opulence of the few scattered amidst a thousand poor; but the abundance and independence of the masses? the wealth that enables them to sustain their

numerous churches, their civil, charitable and literary institutions? to invest millions in public works at home and abroad? to meet the calls of benevolence which come so frequently from the East and the West? to add ornament and luxury to the comfort and competence of tens of thousands of happy homes? Did our ancestors unlade upon these shores the riches of England? Did the mother country, in her maternal kindness, give her daughter a princely dowry? Did it not rather cost us millions to get ourselves safely out of this mother's grasp? Since we can not find the cause in any superior advantages of soil or climate, we must seek the answer in intellectual and moral influences; and of these, none is more fundamental, indispensable and peculiar, and none less unquestionable than our system of primary schools. Each rising generation has received in the family, the school and the church, the moral and mental training that has made the people frugal, temperate, industrious, dexterous in adapting means to ends, provident of the future, and skillful in turning every thing to the best account; which is a sufficient explanation of their unparalleled prosperity. They have gathered wealth from their hard soil, from their granite hills, from their lakes of ice, from every water-fall, more abundant than the golden dust of the fabled Pactolus. They have turned the desert into a garden, the wilderness into a fruitful field, and spread the sails of commerce to every breeze. All this they owe to their common school system; at least as one of the necessary conditions.

But is this all that could have been accomplished? Have the best possible results been realized? Has the system of public education, even in New England, effected the greatest possible good? Might not the system be improved so as to confer still larger blessings on society?

Make the system what it ought to be, what it is within the ability of the people to make it, and what proportion of the children enjoying its blessings, would fail to become useful members of society? This interesting inquiry occupies a prominent place in the present Report of the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. That it might be settled upon the best evidence, he sent out a circular addressed to several of the most distinguished and experienced teachers in the country, asking for an answer to the following question:

“Should all our schools be kept by teachers of high intellectual and moral qualifications, and should all the children in the community be brought within these schools, for ten months in a year, from the age of four to that of sixteen years; then, what proportion,—what per-cent-age,—of such children as you have had under your care, could, in your opinion, be so educated and trained, that their existence, on going out into the world, would be a benefit and not a detriment, an honor and not a shame to society? Or, to state the question in a general form, if all children were brought within the salutary and auspicious influences I have here supposed, what per-cent-age of them should you pronounce to be irreclaimable and hopeless?”—pp. 56, 57.

To this circular answers were returned the tenor of which may be learned from the following extracts:

“My belief is that, under the conditions mentioned in the question, not more than two per cent. would be irreclaimable nuisances to society, and that ninety-five per cent. would be supporters of the moral welfare of the community in which they resided.

“With teachers properly trained in normal schools, and with such a popular disposition towards schools as wise legislation might effect, nineteen twentieths of the immorality which afflict society might, I verily believe, be kept under hatches, or eradicated from the soil of our social institutions.

“Every step in such a progress renders the next more easy. This is proved not only on the grand scale of comparing country with country, and state with state, but district with its adjacent district, and neighborhood with neighborhood.

“Finally;—In the predicament last stated in the circular, and supposing the

teachers to be imbued with the gospel spirit, I believe there would not be more than one half of one per cent. of the children educated, on whom a wise judge would be 'compelled to pronounce the doom of hopelessness and irreclaimability.'—*John Griscom.*

"I should scarcely expect, after the first generation of children submitted to the experiment, to fail, in a single case, to secure the results you have named.

"With my views of human nature, I should not expect to succeed, in every case in securing for each young heart what I understand to be a truly *religious character*. This is not, as I think, wholly a work of education,—for 'neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase;' still, I am firmly of the opinion that the right of expectation of religious character would be increased very much in proportion to the excellence of the training given, since God never ordains means which he does not intend to bless; and he has said, 'Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it.' But I should not forgive myself, nor think myself longer fit to be a teacher, if, with all the aids and influences you have supposed, I should fail, in one case in a hundred, to rear up children who, when they should become men, would be 'honest dealers, conscientious jurors, true witnesses, incorruptible voters or magistrates, good parents, good neighbors, good members of society;' or, as you express it in another place, who would be 'temperate, industrious, frugal, conscientious in all their dealings, prompt to pity and instruct ignorance, instead of ridiculing it and taking advantage of it, public spirited, philanthropic, and observers of all things sacred;' and, negatively, who would not be 'drunkards, profane swearers, detractors, vagabonds, rioters, cheats, thieves, aggressors upon the rights of property, of person, of reputation or of life, or guilty of such omissions of right and commissions of wrong that it would be better for the community had they never been born.'—*D. P. Page.*

"I confess I do not see how our different theological views can essentially alter our modes of instruction. We are all to train the young in the way in which they should go, 'giving line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little,' waiting for, and expecting, precious fruit. The fruit may ripen slowly. From day to day you may not be able to see any progress. This holds true both in moral and intellectual training. But by comparing distant intervals, progress is perceptible. At length a result comes, which repays all the teacher's labor, and inspires new courage for new efforts.

You ask for my own experience. This is my apology for alluding, with freedom, to myself. Permit me to say that, in very many cases, after laboring long with individuals almost against hope, and sometimes in a manner too which I can now see was not always wise, I have never had a case which has not resulted in some degree according to my wishes. The many kind and voluntary testimonials given, years afterwards, by persons who remembered that they were once my wayward pupils, are among the pleasantest and most cheering incidents of my life. So uniform have been the results, when I have had a fair trial and time enough, that I have unhesitatingly adopted the motto, *Never despair*. Parents and teachers are apt to look for too speedy results from the labors of the latter. The moral nature, like the intellectual and physical, is long and slow in reaching the full maturity of its strength. I was told, a few years since, by a gentleman who knew the history of nearly all my pupils for the first five years of my labor, that not one of them had ever brought reproach upon himself, or mortification upon friends, by a bad life. I can not now look over the whole list of my pupils, and find one, who had been with me long enough to receive a decided impression, whose life is not honorable and useful. I find them in all the learned professions, and in the various mechanical arts. I find my female pupils scattered as teachers through half the states of the Union, and as the wives and assistants of Christian missionaries, in every quarter of the globe.

So far, therefore, as my own experience goes, so far as my knowledge of the experience of others extends, so far as the statistics of crime throw any light on the subject, I should confidently expect that ninety-nine in a hundred, and I think even more, with such means of education as you have supposed, and with such divine favor as we are authorized to expect, would become good members of society, the supporters of order, and law, and truth, and justice, and all righteousness."

"Another difficulty, greatly magnified by the zealots of different religious sects, is the apprehension that some one of these sects will get an advantage over the rest. Our constitutions of government, and our laws, recognize no privileged sect, but extend equal protection to all. Good sometimes comes of evil. This very jealousy is a guaranty that this provision of our constitution and laws will not be infringed. Majorities can not rule conscience. As a mere matter of policy, aside from all higher considerations, the only way I can think of, for

any sect to gain an advantage through the medium of our public schools, is to labor, in a large and liberal spirit, more abundantly than any other in the great work of universal education. In Massachusetts, this work moves onward steadily as the sun. The sect that holds back, loses. The sect that tries to foist in its own peculiarities will be sure to be driven from the field, for all other sects will combine, and with reason, against it. In our state of society, we must either abandon common school instruction, or meet on common ground, leaving the peculiarities of each sect to be taught in the family, the sabbath school, and the pulpit."—*S. Adams.*

"If all schools were under the charge of teachers possessing what I regard as the right intellectual and moral qualifications, and if all the children of the community were brought under the influence of these schools for ten months in the year, I think that the work of training up the *whole* community to intelligence and virtue would soon be accomplished, as completely as any human end can be obtained by human means."—*Jacob Abbott.*

"In reply to the specific inquiry, in your circular, what proportion of our youth would probably, under the advantages of schooling presupposed in the circular, fail of fulfilling honorably their social and moral obligations in society, I would say that, in the course of my experience, for ten years, in teaching between three hundred and four hundred children, mostly boys, I have been acquainted with not more than two pupils in regard to whom I should not feel a cheerful and strong confidence in the success of the proposed experiment."—*F. A. Adams.*

"The inquiry is not, 'what proportion of the youth trained in the manner proposed may be expected to possess characters absolutely faultless,' but, 'what percentage might be reasonably expected to go out into the world possessing such characters that their existence would be a benefit and not a detriment, an honor and not a shame to society.'

"Viewing the subject in this light, I do not hesitate to express my conviction that such an education as your question supposes, continued for so long a period as twelve years, and including all the children of the community, would remove a very large portion of the evils with which society is now burdened. I need not say, that I would be far from attributing so important results to any system of merely intellectual training, or even to the most perfect combination of intellectual, physical, and moral discipline, to the exclusion of that which is strictly religious. Such a qualification of my meaning

might have been necessary, on account of the limited sense in which the word education is often used, had not the necessity been removed by the express terms of the conditions annexed to the question in your circular.

"It may indeed be feared that society is not yet fully prepared to put forth the effort necessary to accomplish so desirable a result; but I can not believe that the time is very remote when its attainment will be considered an object of paramount importance. It can not be that the millions of intelligent men, found in this and in other Christian countries, can much longer permit their feelings to be enlisted, and the resources of the communities to which they belong to be employed, in promoting objects of far inferior value; while the advantages of a good system of general education are, in so great a degree, overlooked. If, as I fully believe, it is in the power of the people of any state, by means so simple as your question supposes, and so completely in their own power as these obviously are, so to change the whole face of society in a single generation that scarcely one or two per cent. of really incorrigible members shall be found in it, it can not be that so great a good will continue to be neglected, and the means of its attainment unemployed."—*E. A. Andrews.*

All the other teachers, to whom the circular was addressed, replied in a similar strain, being quite unanimous in the opinion, that such a system of common school instruction as might be introduced, would train to habits of virtue, and lives of usefulness, nearly the whole body of the population.\*

\* The Secretary addressed his circular to eight teachers only, all of whom profess to be evangelical Christians. Why he selected them in preference to others of different views, and exclusive of others, it is natural to inquire. If it was that he might carry the orthodox portion of the people with him, by the force of testimony which they would be likely to respect, while he considered it unnecessary to conciliate by such an expedient the non-evangelical, whose confidence he possesses, we might admire his wisdom. But the use which he makes of the testimony, ostensibly to strengthen an argument otherwise sufficiently strong, but really, it may be suspected, to foist in a caricature of the orthodox creed, commands quite a different kind of admiration. Certainly, if he honestly supposed himself to be giving, in the following words, a just representation of the creed

This united testimony of these eminent teachers is quite satisfactory, the most so of any evidence that the nature of the subject will admit of. It should satisfy the most skeptical, that if our country could for one generation be supplied with a sufficient body of common school teachers, of the right qualifications, and the attendance of all the children be secured for a succession of years, that it would supersede nine-tenths of all the dishonesty, pauperism and crime of the land, besides augmenting the physical strength and prosperity, the competence and wealth of the people, beyond all comparison in the past history of the world. The question, therefore, whether such a system of instruction is practicable, is one of absorbing interest. Mr. Mann undertakes, in his report, to demonstrate the ability of Massachusetts, (and by parity of reason the ability of other states,) with a school fund which yields per

of his correspondents, he has meddled with a matter of which he is not master, in a way to awaken the suspicion that he is capable, as some of his opponents believe, of using his official influence for sectarian ends.

"If they" (says the Secretary, referring to his correspondents) "who believe that there is a principle of evil in the human soul, lying back of consciousness, incorporated as an original element into its constitution, beginning to be when the spirit itself began to be, and growing with it through all the primordial stages of its growth,—which, indeed, belong to the ante-natal period of every descendant of Adam, as much as spottedness belongs to an unborn leopard before it has a skin, or venom to an unhatched cockatrice before it has a sting:—if those who believe this, do nevertheless believe, that our common school system, with certain practicable modifications, can send out redeeming and transforming influences which shall expel ninety-nine hundredths of all the vices and crimes under which society now mourns and agonizes;—then those who dissent from the belief that the natural heart is thus organically intractable and perverse, will be all the more ready to proclaim the ameliorating power of education, and will all the more earnestly labor for its diffusion."

—p. 87.

scholar only one-third as much as that of Connecticut, to provide herself with teachers and schools of this high character, and to secure to herself all the advantages of which we have spoken. He maintains that she can do this without feeling the expense; that she would find the outlay a most profitable investment, a lucrative business transaction, such as any sagacious capitalist would be glad to undertake and pay a bonus for the privilege. Indeed the increase of expense for general education would be small, if the public schools were raised to that degree of excellence, which should save to society the burden of supporting private schools for the same branches of instruction. But it is to be taken into the account, when calculating the cost of the proposed measure, how much society is likely to save by the consequent diminution of vice and crime; and to gain from the greater skill, industry and thrift of the people. The amount of interest thus saved and accumulated, a thousand sources of heavy taxation closed, innumerable sound, intelligent minds actively employed in all branches of industry, and continually developing new materials of convenience and wealth, is incalculable. Only a faint conception of the result can be formed by consulting the statistics of crime, the cost of courts and jails, the loss of property by fraud, theft and arson; or the statistics of vice, as the waste of life and property by intemperance—which would be saved to society by the thorough course of education proposed in this report. The expenses of criminal prosecutions that would be saved to the state by a right education of the people, would more than pay for that education. But a still greater sum would be saved by the prevention of vice; and to all this is to be added the actual gain to society from the more skillful and industrious application of the productive forces of the na-

tion. An English statesman remarked, that England saved the expense of public schools, at a loss of \$50,000,000 annually. The remark has a too just application to our own New England. We owe our salvation to our public schools, and yet suffer them to languish, at the annual sacrifice of millions of dollars. The ambition of the people is rather to live in fine houses, than to rear up a nation of noble men; to hoard or to squander their earnings, rather than appropriate them to the first want of the country, education—to the most money saving of all social expedients—to the most productive of all investments—to universal mental and moral cultivation—the gift to all men of capacity to enjoy the treasures of learning—the elevation of all above mere animal pleasure to the enjoyment of the works of God.

To raise the schools of many of our states to that degree of efficiency necessary to secure the results to which we have alluded, it is not required that the school system should be changed in a single fundamental principle. The statute books of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and some other states, show that every essential condition of success has received legislative sanction. These states have thrown open the school to every child, whether his parents are rich or poor; if very poor, the law provides for his books and his bills. If a child is found growing up in blank ignorance, in the family, the shop, the factory, the state steps in between him and his parents or employer, and provides for his education. The loom shall stop, if need be, rather than that one child shall be deprived of this privilege. Though it may stand on the statute book as a dead letter, yet every town has authority to take a child from his parent, in case of culpable neglect, and bind him out to one who will see to his education and train him to habits of industry. The rea-

son of this provision is the strongest possible: the state must receive that child into its bosom. But the same reason which justifies society in providing at all by suitable legislation for the education of her youth, authorizes her to secure all the ends of that provision, by establishing a thorough and efficient system of instruction, prescribing the course of study and the qualifications of teachers, and exercising a watchful supervision over all the schools. The state, for example, may properly require the towns or districts to raise sufficient money to sustain their schools through the year, under competent teachers, allowing no interruptions except for vacations.

We rejoice that of late years, much has been done in some of our states towards the establishment of such a system. A new spirit seems to prevail. Legislative bodies are turning their attention to this great interest of the country. Washington's last advice may yet be followed by every state in the Union. The subject is fairly before the people. They begin to perceive that the cause of general education is fundamental to every national interest. Nay more—that all men have souls; that education is the natural right of all; that the state owes it not less to God than to herself to train up her youth to that point of mental discipline and moral culture, as well as of rudimental learning, that shall make them independent and valuable citizens. May this spirit accomplish its mission.

There is one measure preliminary to all others, and most vital to the elevation of our public schools; to call attention to which is our principal design, in this notice of the Report before us: we allude to SEMINARIES FOR THE SPECIAL QUALIFICATION OF SCHOOL TEACHERS.

It is now several years since the friends of educational improvement have been laboring to solve the problem,—

*How can a sufficient number of competent teachers be secured for our public schools?* It has been the universal complaint, that good teachers can not be found? It is apparent to the districts—to every discerning parent—that the teacher makes the school. As surely as success in war depends upon the general, so does the improvement of a school depend upon the teacher. It has been said, 'offer wages enough and the market will be supplied.' True. But *wages enough* will not be offered. Were the districts to raise the salary of their teachers to four or five hundred dollars a year, the teachers could afford to qualify themselves for their business, and doubtless many would be qualified. They could spend years at the best institutions to fit themselves for their profession, and seminaries for the special training of teachers would be amply supported, without any state endowment. But no such offer will be made. Wages will increase only with the increase of interest upon the subject of education; and teachers of higher qualifications are needed to create this interest.

What plan, then, at once cheap, efficient and *practicable*, can be devised and carried out in our states, for raising up a corps of well qualified teachers for the public schools?

We propose the following: Let the state establish in some convenient town (or in more than one town if the state is large) a seminary for the training of teachers in the *art of teaching*: not, as in Massachusetts and New York, to educate youth to become teachers, by a two or three years course of study; but for the benefit of those who have studied more or less thoroughly the branches required by law, with a view to instruct them practically in the best methods of teaching: not to educate a few at the public expense for the better schools and higher salaries; but to give to all

teachers an opportunity of learning the art of school government and the best manner of instruction in the usual studies of our public schools, —a seminary in which all the elementary and common branches shall be taught with special reference to illustrating the philosophy of teaching and the best things to be taught. Connected with this seminary and under the same supervision, there should be a school taught upon the principles laid down in the seminary, for the teachers to examine as a model and, to some extent, instruct. It is this model school which has given the term, *normal*, to schools for teachers, in which the best methods of teaching are taught not in theory only, but experimentally.

We would have the system so arranged, that the course of instruction should be completed in one term. This last is the distinctive feature of our plan. The members of the seminary come, not to obtain an education, but simply to review their studies under experienced instructors, and with every facility for clear illustration—and with special reference to the art of teaching. In connection with this review, much information, and that which is most essential for the teacher, would be imparted. The principles of each study would be illustrated and applied in a great variety of ways; for the most essential thing to success in teaching, is *familiarity* with the subjects to be taught. This object would be secured by means of apparatus and familiar lectures.

It is an argument in favor of this plan, that it proposes to *supply at once the most pressing wants of our public schools*. If a two or three years course of instruction were required, it would be many years before the majority of schools could be supplied, by teachers who had enjoyed the advantages of the seminary. This is felt to be a serious objection to a course of preparation so protracted and expensive. But

a seminary, such as we recommend, designed for those who need only to review their studies, and to learn the art of teaching, would make itself felt at once in all the districts of a state. Established upon a liberal plan, supplied with the necessary number of instructors, and all the facilities for teaching and illustration, it might send out a hundred and fifty or two hundred teachers every term. In the smaller states one such seminary would be sufficient.

*This plan is also recommended by its economy.* It would cost the state less than five dollars for each pupil in such a seminary. If the year were divided into four terms of eleven weeks each, and one hundred and fifty pupils were in attendance each term, it is believed the expense for instruction would not exceed four dollars and a quarter per scholar, or a trifle over two thousand and five hundred dollars per annum.\* This is on the supposition that the state makes the tuition free. Arrangements might be made to furnish board, in commons or clubs, at a low rate; so that persons of moderate means could afford to go through the course of instruction. The cost of school-rooms need not enter into an estimate of public expense, for individuals interested either in the location of the seminary, or in the cause of education, would no doubt provide the necessary accommodations.

The economy of this plan would secure another important object, the attendance, at least for one term, of

all the common school teachers. The expense would not be disproportionate to the wages which they would receive for their services as teachers. Few comparatively, at the present standard of wages, would go to the expense of time and board, required in a three years course of preparation; and these few only under the stimulus of high wages and permanent situations in large and wealthy districts. It will be far wiser and more acceptable to the mass of the people, for the states to aim directly at the elevation of all the schools, than to adopt measures, which, for a long course of years, can not benefit a moiety of the number. Teachers will be better satisfied with a plan which places them upon an equality with each other, than with one which creates unpleasant distinctions, by giving a superior education to a few. Institutes or conventions for teachers, owe their popularity to the fact that they are open to all, and that all can afford to attend them. And we have no doubt, that a seminary, such as we recommend, would be equally popular, and a far more efficient means of raising the character of our public schools. It would at once be resorted to by all aspirants to the business of school teaching; for, the districts would distrust any new teacher who could not refer to such evidence of his competence.

The fact that our plan proposes but a single term for normal instruction, may seem to some a sufficient reason for distrusting its wisdom. But this is the feature, to which we attach most importance, believing that a longer period, extending to one or more years, would exceed the means of the majority of teachers; and that one term is amply sufficient for a review of the course of instruction, and for acquiring some practical acquaintance with the art of teaching. This is as much as the present standard of wages will remunerate; and, if not all that

\* The expense has always been the main objection to normal schools. It has been said, it would cost the state from fifty to a hundred dollars for every teacher educated in such a seminary; and then only a few schools could be supplied. Hence we have proposed a plan which, if not all that can be desired, will meet the most pressing necessities of the public schools, cost the state less than five dollars per teacher, and give in three or four years a thorough course of practical instruction to two thousand teachers.

can be desired, enough to insure a much higher style of instruction in our schools. The subject of popular education may yet take a deeper hold of the community, so as to demand teachers of higher qualifications, and furnish the necessary means of educating them. But no considerable number of states are yet prepared to take this step. The wisest course now is, to provide for present necessities, and thus prepare the way for doing more when more is demanded. Already, in the opinion of examining committees—if their certificates mean any thing—our common school teachers understand the studies required by law; and yet they frequently complain in their reports, that many teachers are lamentably deficient in "skill" and "aptness to teach," and are "destitute of a tact at illustration, so as to interest scholars;" and they therefore express their decided opinion in favor of teachers' seminaries. Many of these certificates are no doubt given, not because the candidates are fully qualified, but because teachers of better qualifications can not be had. Who can doubt that one term of instruction, such as we have specified, would remedy to a very great extent the evils of which these committees complain?

For these reasons, it seems to us, that the endowment of a teachers' seminary on this economical plan, is the least that can be expected of any state of our union. The principle of public free schools for all the people, is engrafted into our institutions. None can deny the right and the duty of the state to provide for the education of every child. The only open question respects the character of the schools—the kind of education which they shall be designed and fitted to impart. That our common schools are all that can be desired, no one will pretend. They are susceptible of great improvements. They ought to be made capable of imparting to every

child, as good an education as he could obtain in the first sixteen years of his life, under any other means of instruction. They ought to be made to rank with the best private schools for children of the same age.

But if this is desirable, it is practicable only by means of better teachers—and better teachers will not drop down from the skies. They must be made. Suitable seminaries for training teachers must be provided; and certainly nothing of the kind can be more economical, more within the compass of possibility, more suited to present exigencies, than that to which we now call attention. Promising at a reasonable expense, to make our public school system more efficient and successful, by providing teachers of higher qualifications, what objection can there be to its general adoption? What state can refuse to make the small appropriation necessary to carry out the plan? If it promises, at a reasonable expense, to make the schools more efficient by the better qualification of teachers, no state should hesitate to adopt it. Public appropriations for education, afford richer returns to the state than any other expenditures. Donations to colleges have brought forward young men to serve their country in the various professions, whose talents would otherwise have remained uncultivated. Colleges deserve to be liberally endowed by the state, because every rightly educated man is a blessing to the community. None but the sons of the rich would be able to obtain a collegiate education, if they were taxed for the whole support of the professors, with the interest upon the buildings, apparatus and library of the institution. We need attempt no comparison between the usefulness to a state of common schools and colleges. The good influence of both is beyond computation and perfectly coincident. No other class is so serious of the elevation of common

schools, or so strongly convinced of the utility of teachers' seminaries, as the graduates of our colleges. The legislature of a state could in no way confer a greater benefit on every town, district and family, than by passing an act to encourage teachers to qualify themselves more thoroughly for their work. What a delicate and responsible work it is! They have the mind of the nation committed to them, at the most plastic period of life. They do more than any others, the parents excepted, to form the mental and moral habits of the rising generation. No bungler should be allowed, far less employed and paid, to work upon the tender susceptibilities of childhood, upon the disposition, mind, heart and soul, at the very time, above all others, when every impression made is indelible. As Mr. Mahn remarks, "No unskillful hand should ever play upon a harp, where the tones are left, forever, in the strings."

We cast no censure upon our present teachers. Many of them are able, skillful and efficient; as a body they do as well as can be expected with the facilities and advantages afforded them. Many of them are unable, with the low wages which they receive, to be at the expense of superior qualifications. Let the state come to their assistance. Let them have an opportunity at the public expense, so far as necessary, to acquire a perfect knowledge of all that they are required to teach, and of the best methods of instruction and discipline. Economy is the order of the day; and some may think that our plan pays too much respect to this passion of the people. But others more narrow minded, and representing the penny-wise and pound-foolish principle, may be prejudiced against the measure by their ruling passion. But we beg of them to consider that the truest economy looks beyond the hour and the day to re-

sults often remote but cheaply purchased at much present expense and self-denial. The right education of a generation of children repays for itself by the precious returns of adult years, and never ceases to yield fruit in succeeding ages. We admire the wise economy of a citizen of Kentucky, who said to the collector of the school tax: "I would rather be taxed for the education of the boy than for the ignorance of the man; and for one or the other I am compelled to pay." We beg our narrow-sighted economists to consider the wisdom of this preference; to observe how and why our New England contrasts with Mexico and South America, with Asia and Europe; how every degree of right education diminishes the expenses of the state and of individuals; and increases the knowledge, health, peace, virtue and intelligent piety of the people.

Some may think that such a seminary as we desire must necessarily be temporary; for it would soon supply the schools with teachers. This would be the case if teaching were a permanent business. But new teachers must be constantly in a course of preparation to supply vacancies, for there is no hope of permanency in the office at present. While the average length of time spent in teaching, except in a few large places, is less than two years and a half, the seminary would have enough to do; and at a future day, as soon as there shall be a demand for it, the course of instruction may be extended.

But will not teachers' institutes, or conventions of a few weeks, answer essentially the purposes of such an institution? To this it is an obvious answer, that we can not have the model school in connection with them; and this we regard as an indispensable means of communicating a thorough practical knowledge of the art of teaching.

Is it said that teachers can not be qualified by a three months' course, to instruct in the higher branches? The Report of the Normal School at Albany supplies an answer: "We have been coming down more and more to the primary studies in drilling teachers; here lies the greatest deficiency." The principal of one of the normal schools in Massachusetts has expressed to us the same opinion. To put teachers or scholars into algebra before they understand arithmetic, or into philosophy before they know enough of grammar to apply the principles of the science to the construction of sentences, is subversive of all right education. When the majority of teachers have become so familiar with the elementary studies as to be able to illustrate and teach them in a happy manner, it will be soon enough to take another step. Then, but not till then, the schools will be prepared to enter upon the higher branches. Already where schools have been organized on the best system, and philosophical methods of instruction employed, the higher branches have been introduced with success. A thorough training for the first eight or ten years, will prepare the pupil to enter upon those studies. But this advance can not be made in the great majority of schools, till the preliminary work is far better understood, and far better accomplished.

There is another consideration of some weight in this connection: when teachers are practically initiated into the art of teaching the common branches, they will be good teachers in every study which they understand. A person skillful in illustrating the principles of interest, needs no *normal* instruction in order to teach geometry. The teacher of a district school should be able to adapt his instructions to all minds, to all the mental and moral peculiarities of his pupils. The younger they are, the more de-

pendent will they be upon him for help. He must throw life and interest into twenty different exercises in a day. He must be perfectly familiar with all the "little things," (always the great things in early training,) and know well how to communicate them in the happiest manner. Unlike a professor in college, he must teach mathematics, grammar, elocution, rhetoric, geography, penmanship, English literature and ethics—a little of every thing—all at the same time. Not a day passes but he is called to instruct in the elements of all these sciences. His education, therefore, can not be too extensive and thorough. But the greatest deficiencies at present respect the mere elementary studies, and particularly the art of teaching. We, therefore, think the present aim of the friends of education in all our states should be to improve the elementary instruction of the common schools, by some feasible plan, such as we propose—a seminary for teachers, having accommodations for a hundred and fifty or two hundred pupils; supplied with apparatus and every facility for illustration; under the instruction of those who are in every way competent for the business; connected with a model school taught upon the principles laid down in the seminary; and giving, *each term*, one course of practical drills and familiar lectures in all the studies prescribed by the law of the state for the public schools.

The details of this plan it is unnecessary for us to suggest. Conditions of admission must of course be fixed. A certificate of character, and a declaration of intention to teach for one or more terms, would be required; and the graduates of the schools might be furnished with diplomas that would be current through the state, and supersede the necessity of their examination by school committees. Three terms a year might perhaps

be deemed sufficient; leaving time for teachers' conventions, which are found to awaken interest in the community upon the subject of popular education, and stimulate the zeal of teachers in the work of their

own improvement. By attending these, many would be induced to enter the seminary and receive a thorough course of instruction in the art of teaching.

### ROBERT MURRAY McCHEYNE.\*

THE outward life of McCheyne can be written in a few lines. There were no great or striking events in which he bore a prominent part. Nothing links his name with the history of the state, of the church, or with literature. He passed away too early for that, as but a few of our race have made work for the historic muse, before completing their thirtieth year.

He was born, May 21, 1813, in Edinburgh, and was named Robert Murray, after some of his kindred. We are not informed where he obtained his primary education, but it appears that his mind was bright and active, rapid in learning and retentive. In October, 1821, when a little more than eight years old, he entered the Edinburgh High School, where he continued his literary studies during the usual period of six years. The High School naturally led him to the doors of the University of Edinburgh, which received him in the autumn of 1827, being in his fifteenth year. Here he enjoyed the instructions of Prof. Wilson, (editor of *Blackwood*,) and attracted his attention on several occasions, by the excellence of his poetical and other compositions. A thorough course in this institution prepared him for the Divinity Hall, where in the winter of 1831, he

commenced preparing for the ministry, under Drs. Chalmers and Welch. In the summer of 1831, an elder brother to whom he was strongly attached, was taken away, and this affliction made a deep impression on his heart. He had, at various times, alarming views of his sinfulness, but the pleasures of gay and polite society dissipated such convictions from his vivacious mind. Christ drew him to himself through his afflictions, and his piety ever after bore traces of the process by which he became a disciple. Before the close of the year he had undoubtedly passed from sin to holiness; his love for this world had been supplanted by a new power and nobler affection; and by degrees all his powers, and susceptibilities, and purposes, were brought into captivity to Christ.

He finished his studies on the 29th of March, 1835, and was licensed to preach the Gospel, the first of July of the same year, by the presbytery of Annan. From this time to November, he preached in various places; when he became the colleague of the Rev. John Bonar, in the two fields of labor at Larbert and Dunipace near Stirling. In August, 1836, he preached for the first time, at St. Peter's church, Dundee, where he was ordained, November 24. His ministry was laborious and successful. Near the close of 1838, sickness, to which he seems to have been very liable, compelled him to leave his parish and seek repose and health among his friends

\* The works of the late Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne, Minister of St. Peter's Church, Dundee. Complete in two volumes. Vol. 1, containing his Life and Remains, Letters, Lectures, Songs of Zion, &c. New York: Robert Carter

in Edinburgh. About this time, the leading men of the now free church of Scotland, were contemplating an exploratory visit to the Jews in Palestine and other parts, and it was suggested to McCheyne that he should become a member of the deputation. His heart was in the object, and it was thought that the journey would be conducive to his recovery. Accordingly, with three co-travelers, he started in the spring of 1839, passed through France, crossed the Mediterranean to Alexandria, and from thence went over the desert and explored the Holy Land. On his return he was taken sick off Cyprus, but did not land till he arrived at Smyrna. He was brought to the borders of the grave. After recovering, he returned to Scotland through Turkey, Austria, Poland, and the north of Germany—countries where the Jews are found in great numbers—and arrived at Dundee in November. In the meantime, a wonderful work of grace had been wrought in his parish in connection with the preaching of the Rev. Wm. C. Burns. From this time, his ministry was an almost uninterrupted triumph until his death, which took place on the 25th of March, 1843.

The interior life of McCheyne—the life of his mind—is worthy of study. In treating of this, what we have to say, will for the sake of convenience, be placed under the following titles, *viz.*, natural disposition, scholarship and literary character, piety, and ministerial qualifications.

The disposition of McCheyne was uncommonly good. "From his infancy," says his friend, "his sweet and affectionate temper was remarked by all who knew him." This was a prominent characteristic during his life. It was this among other things, which made him a favorite among his youthful playmates, and his more mature companions. While in the high school,

his associates speak of him as one who had "peculiarities that drew attention,—of a light, tall form, full of elasticity and vigor, ambitious, yet noble in his dispositions, disdaining every thing like meanness or deceit." Being of a vivacious and gay temper, he early became fond of the party of pleasure and the dance. He was thus often seduced from grave occupations, and his mind was diverted from more serious and profitable exercises. This early fondness for gaiety often proved a thorn to him in after years, and was the occasion of repeated transgressions. We have no positive evidence that he was favored with strict religious training at home, yet he was remarkably free from vice and vicious associations. Aside from his love of gay society, his deportment was correct. "Some would have regarded him as exhibiting many traits of a Christian character. I have heard him say," says his biographer, "that there was a correctness and propriety in his demeanor at times of devotion, and in public worship, which some who knew not his heart, were ready to put to the account of real feeling." Yet after all, "his susceptible mind had not, at that time, a relish for any higher joy than the refined gaieties of society, and for such pleasures as the song and the dance could yield."

His love of natural scenery may be mentioned here as it displays his disposition. The beautiful rather than the sublime, was congenial to his spirit. A short extract from his biography will illustrate this trait. "He had great delight in rural scenery. Most of his summer vacations used to be spent in Dumfriesshire, and his friends in the parish of Ruthwell and its vicinity, retain a vivid remembrance of his youthful days. His poetic temperament led him to visit whatever scenes were fitted to stir the soul. At all periods of his life also he had

a love of enterprise. During the summer months, he occasionally made excursions with his father or some intimate friend, to visit the lakes and hills of our highlands. In one of these excursions, a somewhat romantic occurrence befell the travelers. He and his friend had set out on foot to explore, at their leisure, Dunkeld, and the highlands in its vicinity. They spent a day at Dunkeld, and about sunset set out again with the view of crossing the hills to Strathardle. A dense mist spread over the hills soon after they began to climb. They pressed on, but lost the track that might have guided them safely to the glen. They knew not how to direct their steps to any dwelling. Night came on, and they had no resource but to crouch among the heath, with no other covering than the clothes they wore. They felt hungry and cold; and awaking at midnight, the awful stillness of the lonely mountains spread a strange fear over them. But drawing close together, they again lay down to rest, and slept soundly, till the cry of some wild birds, and the morning dawn aroused them."

The affectionateness of his disposition was shown in his regard for his parents, his love for the people of his charge, and in his devoted attachment to the brother whose death has been mentioned. On that occasion, he poured out the sorrows of his heart in more than one poetic effusion, and he often recurred to the sad bereavement, with mournful interest, in after years. In brief, his disposition was such as to render his heart the best soil for the seeds of divine truth, and for the development and full growth of all the graces of the Spirit. Respectful to the aged, familiar, yet delicate in his intercourse with his equals, kind and considerate to those in inferior conditions, gentle and loving towards the young, he inspired the expectation, that if he became a disciple of the Savior, he would

closely resemble "that disciple whom Jesus loved."

As a scholar, McCheyne was more than respectable. It was evident, in early life, that his mind was active in its movements, and so attentive to whatever came before it, that his infant knowledge rapidly accumulated. "At the age of four, while recovering from some illness, he selected for his recreation, the study of the Greek alphabet, and was able to name all the letters, and write them in a rude way upon a slate. A year after, he made rapid progress in the English class, and at an early age became somewhat eminent among his school-fellows for his melodious voice, and powers of recitation." Another fact may be recited in the words of his biographer, as it reveals one secret of his power in after years. "There were, at that time, catechetical exercises held in the Tron church, in the interval between sermons; and some friends remember the interest often excited in the hearers, by his correct and sweet recitation of the psalms and passages of Scripture." His mental powers rapidly unfolded, and sustained a steady growth up to the time of his settlement in Dundee, if not to the close of his useful and happy career. In the high school, he was one of the best scholars in all the classes to which he belonged, and in some branches was distinguished. When about fourteen, he ventured on poetic composition—the subject being, 'Greece, but living Greece no more';—and, as might be expected, his effort was wanting in the divine fervor of the poet, rather than in enthusiastic love of liberty. While in the University, he privately studied the modern languages, and took great delight in gymnastic exercises. Moreover, "he used his pencil with much success, and had a very considerable knowledge of music," being able also to sing correctly and beautifully. We are told that po-

etry was a never-failing recreation, and that he thus drew from Prof. Wilson, a prize in the moral philosophy class, for a poem "On the Covenanters." Notwithstanding this variety of studies and pursuits, he gained some prize in all the various classes he attended.

He had thus received as perfect intellectual training, perhaps, as his native land could furnish to an undergraduate, and now was to come under the influence of the master mind of the college and the church, for Dr. Chalmers reigned in Divinity Hall. Dr. Chalmers had the rare, but most desirable faculty in a teacher, of impressing his character upon others, and McCheyne was a susceptible pupil. "Under Dr. Chalmers for divinity, and Dr. Welch for church history, a course of four years afforded no ordinary advantages for enlarging his understanding." There is evidence that he made good use of his opportunities in the regular studies of the course. Besides this, he paid much attention to collateral studies. He became so familiar with the Hebrew language, that he could consult the original Hebrew of the Old Testament, with ease and pleasure. A voluntary class, of which he was a member, was formed for the purpose of investigating some point of systematic divinity. They afterwards examined the chief points of the popish controversy. Unfulfilled prophecy occupied their attention at other times, and a class not less pleasant and useful than the others, received the name of exegetical. His mind, naturally active and vigorous, had now received a thorough and symmetrical training. The foundation was laid for excellence and eminence in almost any pursuit in which he might engage; but it is plain, that he was best fitted, not only by education, but divine grace, for the gospel ministry. He was not profoundly learned, as no one is, when just entering on professional life;

but the basis was laid for vast accumulations, if time and the providence of God should permit.

It is clear that his poetical powers were overrated by his friends. It is true, he was a fine versifier; it is delightful to read the effusions of his genial and Christian muse; still they are destitute of the divine afflatus. His love of scenery was for the beautiful, rather than the grand and sublime; or in the language of one of his friends, "he had a kind and quiet eye, which found out the living and beautiful in nature, rather than the majestic and sublime." He might have written a volume of readable, useful and popular poems; as a writer of hymns and sacred songs, he might have surpassed most who have written since the days of Watts; but when compared with Pollok—to say nothing of the great masters—his inferiority, in this regard, is seen at once. In a word, he was not a genius, nor is there any evidence that he imagined himself to be one.

His prose style is very fine. Clear, uniform, direct and elegant, it carries the reader along, continually pleased, yet unconscious of the cause: He had what some call ideality fully developed. There is abundance and richness of thought in all his writings, and he had the happy art of interweaving Scripture in all he wrote, as those only can, who have learned to think in the language of the Spirit. Though he never rises to eloquence, yet he is never tiresome. Some speakers are so natural, easy and graceful, that we scarcely notice their appearance, or observe it only to be pleased; while others, by their ambitious elocution, their violent motions, and their patent artifice, fill us with pain. There is the same difference in the style of different writers. McCheyne belonged to the former class. He was never infected by the vice of many writers and speakers, a constant straining for effect; a fault, by

the way, which is a sure proof of mental weakness and poverty. His pure, rich thoughts flow from the "pen of a ready writer," whether in writing a letter, an address, a poem, or a sermon. And though he never astonishes his reader by lofty flights, yet he never fails to command fixed and delighted attention. He is not so much like the moon, now shining in full-orbed splendor, and now waning to paleness, as like the star, shedding a steady and grateful light.

His mind, though not belonging to the first class, was of a high order. It is not often that two such men as Mackintosh and Robert Hall meet in Edinburgh University, or elsewhere; but perhaps we as rarely meet with one like McCheyne. He was characterized for clear and distinct apprehension of his subject, and happy illustration. He loved truth in all departments of knowledge, and was remarkable for candor. "He had an ingenious and enterprising mind—a mind that could carry out what was suggested, when it did not strike out new light for itself. He possessed great powers of analysis; often his judgment discovered singular discrimination." His style is so agreeable and rich; he was so ready and appropriate on every occasion; there was such fullness and beauty in his treatment of every subject he undertook; the effects of the good training of his mind and heart were so visible, as almost to produce the conviction that he was destined to take rank among the most gifted minds, if his life had been prolonged. But though he did not, by the fire of his genius, or the depth of his penetration, or the broadness of his view, "attain unto the first three;" yet his excellencœ as a poet, as a scholar, and as a writer, must command respect and inspire affection.

His religious character exhibited uncommon loveliness, yet there was nothing effeminate in him. Though

never called to such privations and endurance, as placed the heroic stamp upon Brainerd; still it is plain, he was capable of any self-sacrifice which the Master might have demanded.

He was in his nineteenth year when the service of Christ became the delight of his heart rather than the slavery of conscience. There was, of course, a precise time when the great change took place, but for a while it was like the first streaks of dawn struggling with the darkness. Temptations were thick around him, especially those arising from his former fondness for gay society; yet gradually he arose above these allurements, till the pleasures of piety rendered the enjoyments of the world tasteless. On this point his experience, like that of the late Mrs. Van Lennep—and the mention of one of these lovely Christian characters always brings the other to mind—is very instructive to those Christians who are fond of gay scenes, and are carried away by the fascinations of the dance. He found the pleasures of society hindering his growth in grace, and clouding his spiritual vision. Moreover, just in proportion as his religious enjoyment increased, pleasure springing from other sources, seemed insipid. Compared with his sources of happiness, it was as husks to "angel's food." The Holy Spirit carried on his work by continuing to deepen in him the conviction of his ungodlieness, and the pollution of his whole nature. "He stated that there was nothing sudden in his case, and that he was led to Christ through deep and ever-abiding, but not awful or distracting convictions." "At first the light dawned slowly, so slowly that for a considerable time he still relished an occasional plunge into scenes of gaiety." But as the increasing light spreads and scatters the shades of night, and sets the eastern heavens in a glow, so did divine grace, with increasing rapid-

ity, illuminate his soul. From this period his course may be described by the beautiful figure of Scripture—like “the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.”

It is impossible to give a correct portraiture of his religious character, without copious drafts from his diary, and his other writings. We must be content, therefore, however unsatisfactory, to sum it up, under a few specifications, with here and there a brief extract. He soon became familiar with the life of Brainerd, and the writings of President Edwards, and it is most evident that his piety took its type from theirs. Like them he had a deep sense of sinfulness. This will be clear from a short passage. “What a mass of corruption have I been! How great a portion of my life have I spent wholly without God in the world; given up to sense and the perishing things around me. Naturally of a feeling and sentimental disposition, how much of my religion has been, and is to this day, tinged with the colors of earth! Restrained from open vice by educational views and the fear of man, how much ungodliness has reigned within me! How often has it broken through all restraint, and come out in the shape of lusts and anger, mad ambitions and unhallowed words! Though my vice was always refined, yet how subtle and how awfully prevalent it was!” This sense of sinfulness increased upon him, as is the case with all devoted Christians, in proportion as he became holy.

As a consequence, he knew how to deal with sinners anxious about their salvation. He never attempted to soothe or quiet them, or to take their part against God; but rather to deepen their convictions, till they were slain by the law, and thus led to Christ. His humility, the fruit of these deep convictions, was conspicuous, and thus made him

a safe and sympathizing guide. It is interesting to see how pervading was his piety. It extended to all his outward actions; governed his whole life. He was not devotional by fits, and righteous for the nonce, but seemed always to act as if conscious of being under his great Taskmaster's eye, and desirous of securing his approving smile. He “made a conscience of his very thoughts.” His imagination was purified by the Spirit. The love of God sanctified all his other affections. His religion was not a thing apart from life, but pervaded it, and went with him everywhere. In college, in his parish, amid the splendors of London, in France, on the sea, in the lonely desert, in the holy land, among the enemies of all righteousness, in Austrian Poland, he was the same humble, devotional, upright Christian.

He was free from cant. There was no appearance of an effort to seem pious. He had not a sanctimonious mask to put on or take off, according to the company he might be in. But on all occasions, in all companies, he was a warm-hearted, manly and graceful disciple of Christ. True, he used much Scripture language; he talked much about providence; but herein he differed from the canting professor viz., in that the language of the Spirit was the language of his heart; or rather, the Spirit dwelt in him, and so he spake in the dialect of heaven. This was apparent in his letters, as well as in his conversation. Says his biographer:

“To many it was a subject of wonder that he found time to write letters that always breathed the name of Jesus, amid his innumerable engagements. But the truth was, his letters cost him no expenditure of time; they were ever the fresh thoughts and feelings of his soul at the moment he took up his pen; his habitual frame of soul is what appears in them all. The calm, holy, tenderly affectionate style of his letters reminds us of Samuel Rutherford, whose works he delighted to read—excepting only that his joy never

seems to have risen to ecstacies. The selection of his letters may exhibit something of his holy skill in dropping a word for his Master on all occasions. In a note to the members of his family, he says: 'The Tay is before me now like a resplendent mirror, glistening in the morning sun. May the same sun shine sweetly on you, and may He that makes it shine, shine into your hearts to give you the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' There were often such last words as these—'O for drops in the pastures of the wilderness! The smiles of Jesus be with you, and the breathings of the Holy Ghost.' To a friend—'May we have gales passing from Perth to this, and from here to you, and from heaven to both.' To his brother—'I have a host of letters before me, and therefore can add no more. I give you a parting text, Sorrowful, yet always rejoicing.'—pp. 119, 120.

His piety was of the happy kind. He spiritualized all the jubilant passages of the Canticles, and made them the expression of his own joyous religion. In this respect he is as perfect a model as religious biography furnishes. His devotions were not the offspring of ignorance, nor of animal excitement, nor of poetic sensibility, nor of anger aping the manner of righteous indignation; but his soul rejoiced in the Lord, and joyed in the God of his salvation. It may be mentioned, in this connection, that his preaching had a strong tendency to make other Christians happy. Some ministers, it is to be feared, teach their hearers to be wretched; forever harping upon conflicts and trials, as if it were a sin to be happy in this sinful world; as if, forsooth, the heart allied to God, could and should have but little spiritual enjoyment till the glories of heaven blaze around it; as if, again, conflicts and trials did not serve to wean the Christian heart from the world, and fix its affections on the only proper object of supreme love, and the only source of lasting and unalloyed happiness. It was not so with McCheyne, and it is delightful to see the happy effect produced by his joyous piety on other Christians.

The following incident from a little work of his, entitled, "Another Lily Gathered," is illustrative of this point. This little work gives an account of a boy who was converted under his ministry, and who, after much suffering, died in great peace. "One of the loveliest features in the character of this little boy was his intense love to the souls of men. He often spoke with me on the folly of men living without Christ in the world. I shall never forget the compassionate glance of his clear blue eye, as he said, 'What a pity it is that they do not a' come to Christ—they would be sic happy.' He often reminded me of the verse, 'Love is of God, and every one that loveth is born of God.'

His piety was nourished by meditation and prayer, as well as by activity in doing good. The custom of President Edwards, who used to retire to a grove for religious contemplation and worship, was adopted by him. Here is an entry in his Journal: "April 6, [1840.] Lovely ride and meditation in a retired grove." His friend, with whom he was united in preparing a narrative of the visit to the Jews, writes: "Many a pleasant remembrance remains of these days, as sheet after sheet passed under the eyes of our mutual criticism. Though intent on accomplishing his work, he kept to his rule, 'that he must see the face of God before he could undertake any duty.' Often would he wander in the morning among the pleasant woods of Dunsinnan, till he had drunk in refreshment to his soul by meditation on the word of God; and then he took up the pen." The following sentence is from one of his manuscripts: "As I was walking in the fields the thought came over me, with almost overwhelming power, that every one of my flock must soon be in heaven or hell. O how I wished that I had a tongue like thunder, that I might make all hear; or that I had a frame like

iron, that I might visit every one, and say, 'Escape for thy life!' Ah, sinners! you little know how I fear that you will lay the blame of your damnation at my door!" In regard to his devotions he seems to have obeyed the injunction—"pray without ceasing;" and to have understood the parable of Christ, spoken "*to this end*, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint." Yet he had stated seasons for devotional exercises, in which much time was occupied each day. Besides, he used often to rise very early in the morning, especially on the Sabbath, that he might have long continued communion with God, as appears by the following extracts. "Awoke early by the kind providence of God, and had uncommon freedom and fervency in keeping the concert for prayer this morning before light." "Must try to get early to bed on Saturday, that I may rise a great while before day." These early hours of prayer on the Sabbath he endeavored to have all his life, not for study, but for prayer.

His piety was growing from the day he devoted himself to Christ till he died. This fact is proved by his whole recorded life, and by his writings. In the language of his friend :

"He was never satisfied with his own attainments in holiness; he was ever ready to learn, and quick to apply any suggestion that might tend to his greater usefulness. He used, near the close of his life, to sing a psalm or hymn every day after dinner. It was often, 'The Lord is my Shepherd'; or, 'O may we stand before the Lamb.' Sometimes it was that hymn, 'O for a closer walk with God;' and sometimes the psalm, 'O that I like a dove had wings.' A friend said of him, 'I have sometimes compared him to the silver and graceful ash, with its pensile branches and leaves of gentle green, reflecting gleams of happy sunshine. The fall of its leaf, too, is like the fall of his—it is green to-night, and gone to-morrow—it does not sear or wither.'" —p. 133.

As his life was a constant progress in holiness, so his death was answerable to such a life. In his

last hours, whether retaining the control of his faculties, or wandering in delirium, the ruling purpose, the reigning affections of his soul, were equally manifest. He was so sanctified, his heart was a perpetual hymn. "He exclaimed with joyful voice, 'My soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowler; the snare is broken, and I am escaped.' His countenance as he said this, bespoke inward peace. Ever afterward he was observed to be happy; and at supper time that evening, when taking a little refreshment, he gave thanks, 'for strength in the time of weakness—for light in the time of darkness—for joy in the time of sorrow—for comforting us in all our tribulations, that we may be able to comfort those that are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God.' " "He continued most generally engaged, while the delirium lasted, either in praying or preaching to his people, and always apparently in a happy frame, till the morning of his death. On that morning he listed up his hands as if in the attitude of pronouncing the blessing, and then sank down. Not a groan or sigh, but only a quiver of the lip, and his soul was at rest.

As we have already seen, McCheyne had peculiar qualifications for the ministry, in his natural talents and disposition, in his education, and from the teaching of the Holy Spirit. His success was answerable to his qualifications and his fidelity. During the early days of his ministry, he saw no fruits among his bearers, though he was improving rapidly, and getting ready for the harvest already preparing. As if to assure him that Dundee was to be the field of his stated labor, two persons were converted the first night he preached there. He was ordained the 24th of November, 1836, in his twenty-fourth year, and from that time to the day of his death there were probably very few weeks

when some persons were not uncommonly solicitous for the salvation of their souls. His preaching, so far as we can discover, was very plain in style and in the sense of faithfulness in declaring the whole counsel of God. He had a happy faculty for illustrating the truth, and for gaining the attention and the assent of his hearers. His sermons were instructive in religious experience. He soon learned to be methodical in arranging his discourses, and clear in stating his points. His auditors perceived his sincerity; and the affection beaming from his eyes, and every feature of his speaking countenance, melted their hearts. Many loved him who hated his message; and no doubt many were led to Christ through their attachment to his servant. An awful solemnity was produced by his preaching, the audience feeling as if in the presence of Jehovah. During the first two years of his ministry at Dundee, there was no season which we should denominate a revival, but sinners were frequently convicted of sin, and brought into the glorious liberty of the gospel. And in addition, "it was obvious to all that the love of Christians was raised as much by his holy walk as by his heavenly ministry. Yet," says his friend, "during these pleasant days, he had much reproach to bear. He was the object of supercilious contempt to formal, cold-hearted ministers, and of bitter hatred to many of the ungodly; very deep was the enmity borne to him by some—all the deeper because the only cause of it was his likeness to his Master. But nothing turned him aside. He was full of ardor—ever gentle, and meek, and generous; full of zeal, yet never ruffled by his zeal; and not only his strength of 'first love,' but even its warin glow, seemed in him to suffer no decay."

His physical and mental powers were tasked to their utmost strength,

in preaching, in visiting from house to house in a parish containing four thousand souls, in superintending Sabbath schools and holding evening meetings in various sections of his large parish, in conversing with the anxious, in correspondence, and in excursions as an evangelist. "In his brief diary he records, on a certain day, that twenty anxious souls had that night been conversing with him; 'many of them very deeply interested.' He occasionally fixed an evening for the purpose of meeting with those who were awakened; and in one of his note-books there are at least *four hundred* visits recorded, made to him by inquiring souls, in the course of that and the following years." He was entirely devoted to his work, desiring no earthly honors. Believing that his Master had called him to Dundee, he had no desire to leave, till he had an intimation from the same source. In a letter to a friend, he says: "I have been asked to leave this place again and again, but have never seen my way clear to do so. I feel quite at the disposal of my divine Master. I gave myself away to him when I began my ministry, and he has guided me as by the pillar-cloud from the first day until now. I think I would leave this place to-morrow, if he were to *bid* me; but as to *seeking removal*, I dare not and could not. If my ministry were unsuccessful—if God frowned upon the place and made my message void—then I would willingly go; for I would rather beg my bread than preach without success." An anecdote may be mentioned, as bearing on this point. Conversing with a ministerial friend, as to what might be their duty in case of the disruption of the church, and where they might be scattered, —the friend said he could preach Gaelic, and might go to the Highlanders in Canada. Mr. McCheyne said—"I think of going to the many thousand convicts that are trans-

ported beyond seas, for no man car-  
reth for their souls." He loved to  
preach, and thousands hung upon  
his lips with delight. He could  
scarcely ever refuse an invitation to  
preach. And this did not arise from  
the natural excitement there is in  
commanding the attention of thou-  
sands; for he was equally ready to  
proclaim Christ to small country  
flocks. He remarked, "I observe  
how often Jesus went a long way  
for one soul, as for example the ma-  
niac, and the woman of Canaan." In  
the early part of 1843, he went  
on a preaching excursion, by ap-  
pointment of the Convocation.

"He set out as unclouded and happy  
as the sky that was above his head that  
bright morning. During the space of  
three weeks, he preached or spoke at  
meetings in four-and-twenty places, some-  
times more than once in the same place.  
Great impression was made upon the peo-  
ple. One who tracked his footstep a  
month after his death, states, that sympa-  
thy with the principles of our suffering  
church was awakened in many places;  
but above all, a thirst was excited for the  
pure word of life. The people loved to  
speak of him. In one place, where a  
meeting had been intimated, the people  
assembled, resolving to cast stones at him  
as soon as he should begin to speak; but  
no sooner had he begun, than his manner,  
his look, his words, riveted them all,  
and they listened with intense earnest-  
ness; and before he left the place, the  
people gathered round him, entreating  
him to stay and preach to them. One  
man, who had cast mud at him, was af-  
terwards moved to tears on hearing of his  
death."—p. 143.

When setting out on his journey  
to the East, he took pains to secure  
for his flock a faithful shepherd, as  
will appear from the following note  
to Rev. William C. Burns.—"You  
are given in answer to prayer, and  
these gifts are, I believe, always  
without exception, blessed. I hope  
you may be a thousand times more  
blessed among them than ever I was.  
Perhaps there are many souls that  
would never have been saved under  
my ministry, who may be touched  
under yours; and God has taken  
this method of bringing you into my  
place. 'His name is Wonderful.'

During his absence, the Holy Spirit  
was poured out in a wonderful man-  
ner. "The whole town was mov-  
ed. Many believers doubted; the  
ungodly raged; but the word of God  
grew mightily and prevailed." McCheyne  
heard the joyful tidings on his homeward journey, and his  
heart overflowed with joy and grat-  
itude. There was no jealousy and  
repining because God had wrought  
by another, but sincere rejoicing in  
the work. He returned while his  
flock were in the midst of the revi-  
val, and he was ready to enter into  
its spirit. God continued to send  
down his renewing and sanctifying  
influences, till great multitudes of  
the old and young, the rich and poor,  
the vulgar and the fashionable, be-  
lieved on the Lord Jesus Christ.  
After some weeks, the work in a  
measure subsided. We are told,  
"the work of the Spirit went on,  
the stream flowing gently; for the  
heavy showers had fallen, and the  
overflowing of the waters had pass-  
ed by." And the stream continued  
to flow gently, but purely, during  
the remaining three years of his  
life. Several hundred were gath-  
ered into the church of Christ, and  
for the most part, gave evidence  
of being members of the invisible  
church, whose names are written in  
the Lamb's book of life.

The secret of his success was his  
holiness as a Christian, and his fidel-  
ity as a minister. He used to speak  
of discouragement, when God for a  
few months or weeks seemed to be  
withholding his hand from saving  
souls. The following passage de-  
serves to be deeply pondered.

"If he was not right in thus hastily  
forgetting the past for a little, still this  
feature of his ministry is to be well con-  
sidered. He entertained so full a per-  
suasion that a faithful minister has every  
reason to expect to see souls converted  
under him, that when this was withheld,  
he began to fear that some hidden evil  
was provoking the Lord and grieving the  
Spirit. And ought it not to be so with  
all of us? Ought we not to suspect, ei-  
ther that we are not living near to God,

or that our message is not a true transcript of the glad tidings, in both matter and manner, when we see no souls brought to Jesus? God may certainly hide from our knowledge much of what he accomplishes by our means, but as certainly will he bring to our view some seals of our ministry, in order that our persuasion of being thus sent by him may solemnize and overawe us, as well as lead us on to unwearyed labor. Ought it not to be the inscription over the doors of our Assembly and College-halls—‘Thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savor of his knowledge by us in every place.’ 2 Cor. 2: 14.”

What valid reason is there for doubting the truth of this view? When we doubt that God crowns faithful exertions with success, do we not excuse ourselves quite as much as we honor divine sovereignty? The ministry of Christ was short, but more than five hundred brethren—all his disciples—saw him at one time. (1 Cor. 15: 6.) The labors of the Apostles were wonderfully successful. Edwards, Brainerd, Wesley, Tennent, Whitefield, and other holy men, are witnesses that God blesses the faithful and holy. This was the belief of McCheyne. “In the case of a faithful ministry, success is the rule; want of it the exception. For it is written, ‘In doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.’ He expected it, and the Lord exceeded his hopes.” At one time he writes, “I feel persuaded that if I could follow the Lord more fully myself, my ministry would be used to make a deeper impression than it has yet done.”

We know not what he might have done, for he was about to be summoned to another sphere of labor. Nor was he unprepared. In the January preceding his death, “he was breathing after glory.” In his letters, written a short time before his death, but while he was in usual health, there are such expressions as these: “I often pray, Lord, make me as holy as a pardoned sinner can be made.” “Often, often, I

would like to depart and be with Christ—to mount the Pisgah-top, and take a farewell look of the church below, and leave my body and be present with the Lord. Ah, it is far better!” Again: “I do not expect to live long. I expect a sudden call some day—perhaps soon—and therefore I speak very plainly.” According to his full persuasion, he died early, but he has left us the record of a godly and useful ministry for our admonition and encouragement. Nor can we wonder that the death of such a man made a deep sensation in Dundee. On the evening after his death, his people were met together in the church, “and such a scene of sorrow has not often been witnessed in Scotland. It was like the weeping for king Josiah. Hundreds were there; the lower part of the church was full; and none among them seemed able to contain their sorrow. Every heart seemed bursting with grief, so that the weeping and the cries could be heard afar off. On the day of his burial, business was quite suspended in his parish. The streets, and every window, from the house to the grave, were crowded with those who felt that a prince in Israel had fallen; and many a careless man felt a secret awe creep over his hardened soul, as he cast his eye on the solemn spectacle.”

A word about the “Life and Remains.” The author of the one and the editor of the other, is the Rev. Andrew Bonar, of Callace, Scotland, a friend of McCheyne, and a congenial spirit. We earnestly recommend the work to private Christians and young ministers, as filling a place in the library which no other can. Feeling grateful to the friend who called our attention to the contemplation of a character so holy and so lovely as that of McCheyne, we are sure of receiving the thanks of all who may be induced by us to read his life and writings.

We know not how more appropriately to conclude our notice of this lovely Christian, than by the following beautiful lines, before unpublished, in which the flimsy intangibilities of religious transcendentalism, bewildering the head while they chill the heart, the rapturous intensity of highly wrought religious emotion, the noisy zeal and pretension of excited animal feeling, and the deeper and more powerful, but fluctuating impetus of periodical piety—all pass in review to be condemned, while the true elements of the Christian's *interior life*, constancy and progress, are evolved from the beautiful comparison of Scripture, Isa. 48: 18,—“Then should thy peace have been as a river.”

Not like the *cloud*, whose misty fold,  
Gathers around some mountain height:—  
Its graceful wreaths are thin and cold,  
Ever most dim to nearest sight.  
Its golden haze decks sun-lit skies,  
Or glows beneath the setting day,—  
But night shall dim its glorious dyes,  
The wind shall drive it far away.

Not like the *shower*, whose freshening drops  
Wake to new life the sun-parched day,  
Whose rustle in the tall tree tops  
Sends heart-thrills to each quivering spray:—  
Though rainbows rise to span the scene,  
Though grateful songs its welcome speak,  
Sinking from sight, that crystal's sheen  
To-morrow thou in vain may'st seek.

Not like the *brook*, whose onward rush,  
So full of sparkling, noisy glee,  
Awoke from emulous birds a gush  
Of ringing, wild-wood ecstasy:—  
Alas for flowers, that, on its bank,  
Hang their bright heads, and, drooping, die!  
The summer's sun its waters drank,  
And now its pebbly bed is dry.

Not like the *wave*, whose measured swell  
Breaks gently on the silver sand,  
Or, gathering might beneath the wing  
Of tempests, smites the echoing strand:—  
Wave after wave may seek the shore,  
And on their wealth of waters urge  
A few brief hours—then turns the tide,  
And backward rolls the inconstant surge.

But like a *river*, calm and clear,  
A stately river, full and free,  
Whose broad expanse, serenely spread,  
The blue sky's mirror well may be,  
Yet with a steady current's force  
Is ever hastening to the sea:—  
No vexing wind, no ebbing tide,  
No shallow sources quickly dried,  
Have power to stay its onward course:—  
Such is the peace thine heritage shall be,  
Peace like a river gives thy God to thee!

#### THE PROPOSED SUBSTITUTION OF SECTARIAN FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

In the last number of our last volume, in a note to an article on “The common school controversy in Massachusetts,” we announced our intention to give a distinct consideration to the subject of “parochial schools”—by which phrase we mean church schools—schools under the direction, control, and support of religious sects or denominations.

This subject has, of late, been urged on the public attention in various ways. For many years past, in this country, several religious denominations have manifested not a little uneasiness at the prevalent common school system, because it excludes (as from its nature it must)

all distinctively sectarian religious instruction; and have evinced a desire to have schools which would be under their exclusive supervision. The Roman Catholics almost universally, their priests quite universally, have opposed the attendance of children of that denomination upon the public schools; and have, in some instances, requested or demanded a portion of the public school money for the support of Roman Catholic schools. Episcopal conventions, and Episcopal bishops in their charges, have recommended the establishment of Episcopal schools, especially those of a higher grade. The section of the Presbyterian church, called “old

school," in their periodicals, at meetings of Presbyteries and Synods, and, for a few years past, at the annual meetings of their General Assembly, have given earnest consideration to the subject of "parochial schools." The able Secretary of the Assembly's Board of Education, (Rev. Cortland Van Rensselaer) has been unwearied in urging the matter upon the attention of the ecclesiastical bodies, and of the members of that church. The General Assembly have listened, year after year, to elaborate reports from committees appointed to investigate the subject, and to recommend appropriate plans, ways, and means. And they have expressed "their firm conviction that the interests of the church, and the glory of the Redeemer demand, that immediate and strenuous efforts be made, as far as practicable, by every congregation, to establish within its bounds one or more primary schools." Circulars have been addressed, in the name of the General Assembly, to all the Presbyteries and Sessions of that church, urging action according to this recommendation, and calling upon all to contribute by annual collections, and, as individuals may be disposed, by donations and legacies, to form and maintain a Presbyterian school-extension fund, for the support of Presbyterian schools within the limits of feeble churches. And to the Assembly's Board of Education is committed the care of this fund, and the general supervision and direction of the schools thereby organized and sustained.

Meanwhile the Congregationalists have not been uninterested spectators of this movement among their Presbyterian brethren. Some among them have approved it, and have been disposed to encourage one of similar character within their own communion. At the last meeting of the General Association of Congregational ministers in one of the New England states, a para-

graph was introduced into the annual report or circular on the state of religion, commanding in high terms the system of church schools, brought to the notice of the Association by the report of the delegate from the old school General Assembly. The paragraph, however, excited decided, and so far as appeared, general disapprobation, and was immediately stricken out.

In Great Britain, also, the same subject, modified however by the peculiar and diverse relations of the religious denominations of that country to the state, has awakened general attention and discussion. And there too, has been strong opposition to common or state schools, and chiefly from the same cause, a jealousy that either wrong religious instruction, or no religious instruction, would be given in those schools. Some have gone so far as to contend, that the government, whether national, provincial or municipal, has no more *right* to undertake the cause of education than the cause of religion, and that there should be a complete divorce of the state from institutions of education, as well as from the church or the institutions of religion—a discussion, in which men of the most opposite religious sentiments, and most diverse ecclesiastical relations, have often found themselves side by side.

It is, then, upon a subject of widely excited, as well as deserved, interest, that we propose to write. It is a subject, it need not be said, of profound importance: for every question bearing decidedly upon education, especially popular education—upon that which is the chief work of the people of every generation, the work of rightly educating their successors—is of immense moment.

The thoughts, which we have long been maturing on this subject, we shall endeavor to present in a series of distinct, yet closely related, observations.

I. The two systems of popular education, the common school system, and the church school system, can not prosperously coexist, if indeed they can coexist at all.

Every person of experience or observation respecting popular education, knows that the prosperity of schools demands the general interest and united support of the communities wherein they exist. If, in a given place, there are two systems of schools, common or public schools, and church schools, they will divide the interest and support of the community, and must be feeble and imperfect, and would both be in danger of failure. The church or denominational schools would receive, so long as they existed, the whole, or the partial, strength and support of their own denomination. If they receive the *whole* denominational strength, they will ruin the public schools, leaving to them only the attendance and patronage of that less intelligent portion of the community, who have no connexion with any religious congregation. If they receive a *part* of the denominational strength of the place, they will destroy, if not the existence, certainly the prosperity of the public schools, taking away from them a considerable portion, and probably the better portion of the pupils of the place, those best trained, by example, precept and authority, at home, and with them the pecuniary support and earnest interest of their parents, which will usually go with their children. In a few cases, perhaps, in cities and large towns, where all the religious denominations are strong, and well disposed both in residence and in feeling for the support of their own schools, (which conditions would rarely exist, even in such places) both the public schools and the church schools might have a measure, though not a large measure, of prosperity. But in all other cases, (and these would be

forty-nine in fifty, if not ninety-nine in a hundred,) the schools, both public and sectarian, would be poorly sustained, and poor in character. Take, for instance, a town, like the greater number of the towns in this country, numbering from twelve hundred to twenty-five hundred inhabitants, divided between four or five religious denominations, with difficulty sustaining their several religious institutions, located partly in the center of the town, and partly in different and remote districts; and let their patronage and interest be distributed between public schools, and church schools of four or five kinds—how plain is it, that all the schools, public and sectarian, would be feeble in strength and poor in character, if indeed they could exist at all. Is it said let the public schools go down, and let the strength of each church be united on their own school or schools? The topic involved in that remark, we will discuss soon. What we now say and argue, is this, that the two systems of schools can not *prosperously coexist*, if indeed they can coexist at all.

Let then our eyes be open to the truth, that the introduction and support of a system of church schools would be a death-blow to the prosperity, and probably to the existence, of public schools. The two can not flourish, in most cases they can not live, together. The question, of the introduction and support of a system of church schools, is simply the question of the *substitution* of church schools for public schools—the question, whether the system of common schools shall be given up and destroyed.

II. On the question, thus reduced, it is pertinent to say, that while the church school system is new and untried, yet to be introduced and established, the common school system is established, tried and funded.

In all the northern and middle

states, it has been in operation for many years, in some of them for more than two centuries. In all the western states it has been established, so far as any thing is established in a country where society and all its institutions are so new.

To this long established system, the principles, feelings, practices and habits of the people, and the legislation of their states, towns and districts, have been conformed. They, therefore, who would make a revolution in these long established principles and practices of society, so inwoven with their feelings and tender, reverential associations, a revolution, such as would be produced by the banishment of the old, and the introduction of a new system, are bound to show very strong reasons.

Moreover, this system, having been so long tried, has been found, wherever justice has been done to it by general interest and energetic and judicious administration, to work well, surpassingly well, securing a more general diffusion of elementary education than has existed anywhere else on the globe. It is owing chiefly to the common schools of New England, that we so rarely find one of its native population who can not read and write. In order, therefore, to be justified in any attempt to substitute an entirely new and different system for one which has been so long tried and been found to work so well, we must bring very strong and indubitable proofs that the new system is the best; we must make out a very clear and strong case. "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." To give up a tried for an untried system, to give up practiced and proved excellence for theoretical excellence, is, to say the least, hazardous. The superiority of the new system must be proved, we will not say more clearly than any theory can prove it, but very clearly, so as to admit of no doubt.

It ought, in justice to the General Assembly (old school), from whom this recommendation of the establishment of church schools has come, to be said, that they have under their jurisdiction churches and Presbyteries, in a part of the country, (the southern states,) where the means and institutions for general education are very defective, and it may be claimed that there church schools can be instituted and supported with better success than common schools. We doubt even this; at least, we can not reasonably be asked to believe it, till we have its proof. We do not see why the same reasoning will not apply to that country, which will apply to any country sparsely settled. We do not know, and we have not at hand the means to inform ourselves, to what extent the common school system has been introduced and practiced, or funded in those states. We only know that their statistics show a lamentable deficiency of general education, even among the whites; and that the education of a large part of their inhabitants, the slaves, is forbidden, by public opinion in all those states, and in most of them by infamous laws and penalties. But we can not see that this anomalous condition of their population affects the present question: for we learn, that it is neither recommended nor contemplated by the General Assembly, to give to the colored population of the slave states any share in the privileges of the Presbyterian church schools. This neediest portion of the needy population under their care, do not come within the range of the blessings of the church fund for the support of schools among the needy. Still, it is true, that the absence or feeble existence in that part of the country of a common school system, does diminish there the weight of the objection which we are now urging against the introduction of the new church school system. But, it is not in their churches in the south-

ern states only, it is in the middle and northern states also, that they recommend the establishment of church schools, one or more within the bounds of each; in the state of New York, where the common school system is carried on as completely and prosperously as in any state of the Union, as well as in Arkansas; in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois and Wisconsin, as well as in Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Mississippi, and the other slave states.

Then, again, another fact calls for strong and indubitable proof of the superiority of the church school system, to the common school system, before we can be justified in the attempt to displace the former by the latter, a fact only alluded to thus far—the endowment of common schools by large funds. It is unnecessary for our purpose to make a full and accurate statement of the school funds of the several states. Suffice it to say, that they all or nearly all have funds for this purpose. Connecticut has more than two millions of dollars. And some of the western states, if they take proper care of the lands appropriated for this purpose, will be still more munificently endowed. Now, if common schools are displaced by church schools, what shall be done with this fund? It must be alienated from the purposes of general education, its only lawful object, or it must be divided among the several religious denominations. The latter, doubtless, would be generally demanded, and would be attempted. But who does not see at once, the great loss and risk of such an operation? Between the state legislatures and their agents, who, especially in some of the new states, are not over faithful and careful now, and the agents of the several denominations, how much would be lost by mismanagement, negligence and otherwise, before it reached its destined object, the schools? Besides, on what

principle could it be divided? Doubtless, the only fair principle of division would be, *pro rata*, distribution according to the number of members of each denomination, or of children in, or of a suitable age to be in, its schools. But what an arena would here be opened for sectarian mustering and numbering of the people, for proselyting, manoeuvring and strife! Surely, we have temptations enough for the cultivation, and enough actual cultivation and exercise of the sectarian spirit now, without the additional stimulus of a large pecuniary reward. Better than this, it might be (are we not justified in saying *would be*) to cast all the school funds to the bottom of the sea.

III. The preceding course of thought, showing the necessity of proving, and proving indubitably, the decided superiority of the church school system to the common school system, before any attempt can, with reason and propriety, be made to substitute the former for the latter, brings us to a comparison of the merits of the two systems.

And here, after no little investigation and consideration of the matter, we are impelled by our thorough convictions to take the position, that for the educational purposes and interests of a country like ours, the tried and established system of common schools, instead of being inferior, is decidedly superior in merit to any system of church or sectarian schools. If we were now to begin anew, the former ought to be chosen.

It is hardly necessary to consider under this topic, a question, which, if discussed at all, should be discussed here at the outset: for it is a question, which, though agitated extensively in Great Britain by some among the opponents of church and state, has not, to our knowledge, been raised in this country—the question, whether the state has any right to interpose or act at all for the promotion of education.

That question could hardly be raised here. It could not find enough variety or division of opinion to secure its discussion. For, it is well understood in this country, and generally, if not universally, admitted, that the civil government has a right to do whatever the general interests of society require that it should do—not whatever the general interests of society *require to be done*: for there are many things which those interests require to be done, that can be much better done by other agents than the government; but whatever the general interests of society require that *it* (the government) should do. If the interposition of government in matters of education is necessary in order to the most successful prevention of crime, it surely has a right so to interpose: for, as Mr. Macaulay once said, “whoever has a right to hang (or punish in any other way, we say,) has a right to educate.” If such interposition is necessary in order to equalize the burden, much more in order to secure the general prevalence, of what is so essential to civil interests as education, surely it is rightful. If such interposition is necessary in order to prevent children from growing up to be paupers or criminals, certainly it is rightful, even though, so far as the parent is concerned, it be compulsory. No man having a family of children, has a right to bring them up in such ignorance and vice as to make them a burden and pest to society. If he persists in so doing, the civil power, may justly and properly step in and take his children from him, and put them under guardianship, which will, so far as they are concerned, secure the safety of society. This is a right which the towns of New England, through their selectmen, have always exercised. Such instruction, even of a moral nature, as may be essential for securing the end, for which it was divinely ordained, of

being “a terror to evil doers and a praise to those who do well,” civil government may rightly give, if its interposition for that purpose be necessary. We agree fully with Dr. Vaughan, one of the safest as well as most comprehensive and powerful minds among the Congregationalists of Great Britain, the editor of the British Quarterly Review, and President of Lancashire Independent College, who says, in a letter to the editor of the Morning Chronicle, “It is with me a maxim, and one which I do not think any logic can disturb, that government *may* be a moral teacher to the extent in which it *must* be a moral administrator.” In a word, it is a well established principle with us, that civil government has a right to do whatever it is best, and has no right to do whatever it is not best, for the interests of society, that it should do.\*

\* On this point we cite the authority of Daniel Webster. “In this particular, New England may be allowed to claim, I think, a merit of a peculiar character. She early adopted, and has constantly maintained the principle, that it is the undoubted right, and the bounden duty of government, to provide for the instruction of all youth. That which is elsewhere left to chance, or to charity, we secure by law. For the purpose of public instruction, we hold every man subject to taxation in proportion to his property; and we look not to the question whether he himself have, or have not, children to be benefited by the education for which he pays. We regard it as a wise and liberal system of police, by which property, and life, and the peace of society, are secured. We seek to prevent, in some measure, the extension of the penal code, by inspiring a salutary and conservative principle of virtue and of knowledge in an early age. We hope to excite a feeling of respectability, and a sense of character, by enlarging the capacity, and increasing the sphere of intellectual enjoyment. By general instruction, we seek, as far as possible, to purify the whole moral atmosphere, to keep good sentiments uppermost, and to turn the strong current of feeling and opinion, as well as the censures of the law, and the denunciations of religion, against immorality and crime. We hope for a security, beyond the law, and above the law, in the prevalence of enlightened and well-principled moral

Through what forms and departments of the civil government of a people, this right of interposition and control may be best exercised, is an open question. In this country, it is plain that this matter should be left to the people of the several states, to be regulated by them, through the governments of the state, town and district. And it is plain, moreover, that while there must be, to some extent, state legislation and supervision of common schools, yet, as we intimated in our note to a former article, (Vol. V, p. 516,) it is best to leave the management, supervision and control of the schools mainly to the people of the several towns and districts. They will thus be most easily and pleasantly adapted to the varied and numerous peculiarities of numerous places and districts, and will also reap that advantage of quiet, satisfaction and energy, which usually attends freedom from the restraints and guidance of a central power. It may be properly questioned whether there has not been, particularly in Massachusetts and New York, more than is wise of the supervision and interposition of the central power of state officers and state boards of education.

But we are indulging discussion

---

sentiment. We hope to continue and prolong the time, when, in the villages and farm-houses of New England, there may be undisturbed sleep within unbarred doors. And, knowing that our government rests directly on the public will, that we may preserve it, we endeavor to give a safe and proper direction to that public will. We do not, indeed, expect all men to be philosophers or statesmen; but we confidently trust, and our expectation of the duration of government rests on that trust, that, by the diffusion of general knowledge and good and virtuous sentiments, the political fabric may be secure, as well against open violence and overthrow, as against the slow but sure undermining of licentiousness."—(*Journal of Debates in the Convention to revise the Constitution of Massachusetts, 1821, page 245.*)

on a point where we intended little more than an allusion.

The right of the civil government, through its various departments, to establish, support and regulate a system of common schools, (and it is by the civil government that this usually has been, and for aught we see must usually be, done,) this right being admitted, provided there is occasion for its exercise, we are brought to consider the position already taken—the superiority of the established and tried common school system to the proposed substitute, the church school system.

1. The common school system secures the general, we may say the universal, education of the people. The church school system would not. There would be a large number, who could not be reached by it, and who would grow up in ignorance. This is the first reason we offer to sustain our position.

This is a truth, (we will prove it to be such presently,) whose importance can not easily be exaggerated. Its importance we do not here argue. That would be superfluous. If there be any man who now denies that knowledge is good, or that an elementary education at least, is necessary to make one a good citizen, "he must," as another has said, "be looked upon as a fossil relic of a past world—an antediluvian—one who is born behind the time." We do not expect to number any such man among our readers. It is not necessary here to prove the intimate connection between ignorance and vice, nor that knowledge and virtue are specially important and necessary for the citizens of a free country. A free people need the intelligence to discern the true amid the false, and the virtue to love and obey it. They must have the intelligence to understand and defend their rights, and to retain in their own hand the exercise of their lawful powers,

against all the machinations and arts of the ambitious, the designing, and the powerful. Despotism stands on popular ignorance : freedom on popular intelligence and virtue. And no cunning or care of man can make them change foundations. Among an intelligent and virtuous people, freedom will, sooner or later, displace despotism. Among an ignorant people, despotism will displace freedom. And for the security, much more for the prosperous working, of civil liberty, this intelligence must be extended to the *whole* people. It must be diffused as widely as is the exercise of political sovereignty. Where almost every man over twenty-one years of age has a part in electing those who are to enact and execute laws, and make war or peace, it is unsafe to leave any such men, or their parents, or sisters, or any who form their character, or influence their conduct, without the enlightening and conservative power of education. It is not enough for the rich to educate their children, if the children of the poor are left to ignorance. It will not avail for Protestants to educate their children, if the children of Roman Catholics are left without knowledge and discipline. It will not avail for the members of churches and Christian congregations to give their children instruction in good schools, if the children of those who care neither for Sabbaths nor sanctuaries, grow up untaught and ungoverned. The ballots of the one class weigh as much in the scales of the nation's destiny, as those of the other. They are all embarked in the same ship, to sink or swim together, and the ignorance and vice of a part endanger the prosperity and existence of the whole.

And this, by the way, seems to us a strong argument to prove that a republican form of government, and a liberal extension of the elective franchise, are in accordance

with the divine arrangement and pleasure : for they tend, more powerfully than do other forms of government and restricted suffrage, to this excellent end—knowledge and goodness among the people ; since they lay on the community a strong constraint to educate and evangelize all its members. They use the powerful instinct of self-preservation in a nation, to compel it to give the means of knowledge and of grace to all its citizens.

That the common school system, if wisely and efficiently directed and supported, would secure the general, indeed we may say the universal, prevalence of elementary education, is no conjecture. We know it. We know it from the experience of the past. We know what it will do by what it has done. There is left no room for reasonable doubt on this point, by the fact, that, in those states wherein the common school system has any thing like a wise and energetic administration, the elementary education of the native population is universal—that few persons indeed can be found, born and bred in those communities, who can not read and write. It may be said, that the trial has not been sufficient or fair, since the population of these states has been, in the past, very unlike what it will be in the future, homogeneous. But it would be said without reason : for there has been from the beginning a variety of races, the white, the red, and the black, and, after the first century, and extensively for the last fifty years, a variety on the most important matter of discrepancy, religious opinion, certainly a large variety of the Protestant sects. True, we have not had in these states as many Roman Catholics as we expect in the future to have, through the channels of immigration ; and there has been, in many cases, and perhaps in a large proportion of cases, a refusal by Roman Catholics to allow their chil-

dren to attend the common schools. But this refusal, we believe, has been owing mainly to a lack of due liberality on the part of the directors and teachers of these schools toward Roman Catholics—to the fact that they were not allowed to come into the schools on any other than a Protestant footing—that their religious peculiarities have not had the same liberal treatment, and have been denied a title to the same liberal treatment, which the religious peculiarities of Protestants have received—to the fact, in a word, that it has been insisted, unwisely and unfairly as we think, that the common schools should be *Protestant* schools, and that, if the children of Roman Catholics came into them, they should conform to *Protestant* rules, and receive a *Protestant* education. Wherever the opposite principle has been adopted, and acted upon long enough to banish jealousy and excite confidence, there has been no difficulty in securing the attendance of Roman Catholic children.\* And we anticipate little difficulty in securing their general attendance in the future, whenever the jealousy and opposition, which have unwisely been excited among the Roman Catholics, shall be allayed by the adoption of the principle, manifestly reasonable and just, that in the common schools the religious peculiarities of all denominations shall receive like treatment, and be alike free from invasion.

On the other hand, if, for this school system, which, whenever fairly and efficiently administered, has secured, and manifestly will secure, the elementary education of the whole people, we substitute the church or sectarian school system, the certain result will be, that many,

very many of the people will not be educated at all—large masses will grow up untutored and undisciplined.

Of this truth a little examination and reflection will convince any one. In the first place, there is in this country, and even in those parts of it which have had the most and best religious culture, a large mass of people (much larger than they who have not examined into the matter are aware) who do not belong to any religious denomination. All these would have a strong dislike of sectarian schools, whose avowed object is to train children in the doctrines and practices of a particular denomination or sect of Christians. Their children might, in some instances, be gathered into the church schools, by the benevolence and zeal of the teachers and patrons. But the instances would be few. The great majority would refuse to send their children, especially if (as it must be to a greater extent and degree than under the common school system) any payment should be required.

Then, again, some religious denominations, in all places, would have no schools, or schools inadequate to the number of the children belonging to them; and yet would not, to any great extent certainly, send their children to the schools of other denominations. How is it now with Roman Catholic children, in places where, through jealousy of Protestant instruction, they are not sent to the common schools? To a fearful extent, they are without any school, growing up to maturity—to the exercise of social influence and of popular sovereignty—without instruction or discipline. And who does not know, that the Roman Catholic church never has, in any country, secured, or favored, the education of *all* her people; and that, in this country, she is not strongly disposed, and, if she were, would be unable, such is the poverty of a

\* We hoped to receive, but have not, in season for insertion in a note at this point, statistical proof of the truth of this statement: we have, however, information in a general form which fully warrants us in making it.

large proportion of her members, to sustain schools adequate for the purpose. Nothing is more certain, than that, between the invincible repugnance of that church to send her children to schools of other churches avowedly sectarian, and her indisposition and inability to maintain adequate schools of her own, large masses of her children would be left to ignorance with all its dangers, crimes and miseries.

The same would be the result to a large extent with other denominations. Few of any denomination have a sufficient sense, and many may be said to have no sense at all, of the importance of education. In almost all except the large places of this country, some of the religious denominations are few in numbers, feeble in strength and scattered in location, and yet none the less attached to their peculiarities, hardly able, often unable, and more often indisposed, properly to sustain their religious institutions. Now what is more certain, than that, in such cases, on the one hand they will have no schools of their own, or schools very insufficient for the necessities of children scattered here and there over a town three or five miles square, and that, on the other hand, they will not send their children to the schools of other denominations, established and sustained for instruction avowedly sectarian?

With these views of the subject—and we see not how any other can reasonably be taken—we regard it as certain, that, if the system of church schools is substituted for the system of common schools, multitudes, even in portions of the country most favored, and much more in those least favored, with moral and religious privileges, will grow up without the instruction and discipline of even an elementary education. This is a result worthy to be seriously pondered by all, and especially by those who are disposed, with more or less earnestness, to in-

duce a church school system, which, if successful, will infallibly displace the common school system, and become the sole reliance for popular education.

2. We now call the attention of our readers to a second reason for our confident belief in the superiority of the common school to the proposed church school system.

The church schools must, in many, the vast majority of cases, be inferior in character to the common schools.

A few words will suffice to make this plain. It is proved by a class of facts to which allusion has already been made, such as these, the prevalent inadequate sense of the importance of general education, and the consequent indisposition to contribute freely, much less with self-denial, for that end; the minute sectarian divisions which exist in most places; and the widely distant residences of members of the same denomination in the same town. These facts which do not materially affect the common schools, in which all can unite, are fatal, in a vast majority of cases, to the excellence, if not the existence, of church schools, supported, each, solely or chiefly, by those of its own denomination. Any one acquainted with these facts, as they exist in our country towns, will see in a moment, that church schools of a high order would generally be impracticable, certainly, as men are, not to be expected. In towns of from twelve to twenty-five hundred inhabitants, divided into four or more religious denominations, whose members are distributed over a surface four miles square or three miles by five—who that knows with what difficulty, or reluctance, and insufficiency, they support their religious institutions, does not know, that, if they attempted, in addition thereto, to support church schools, these schools would be very meagerly sustained, if sustained at all; would very imperfectly accom-

modate the scattered members of the denomination, being at great distance from many of them; and would inevitably be of very inferior character? Church schools in large cities, and one central church school for the ablest denominations in our largest towns, might be well sustained; but, in all other cases, they must be of inferior merit, comparing very unfavorably with common schools, endowed, as these are, by state funds, attended by the children, and possessing the interest and good will of the parents, of all denominations, and located so as to accommodate the inhabitants of every neighborhood.

How much better, then, to direct our zeal, wisdom, energy and pecuniary liberality, to the improvement of our common schools, to secure for them generally, that high degree of perfection, of which, in many instances, they have by experiment been proved capable, than to direct these forces to the establishment of church schools, which, if generally established, will destroy common schools, and will be, after all, of very inferior character.

3. We have another reason for our decided preference of the common school, to the church school system. It is in accordance with the nature and necessities of our free institutions, with the comprehensive character of Christianity, and with the liberal spirit of the age.

The influence of the church school system, on the other hand, will be sectarian, divisive, narrow, clanish, antirepublican.

This we regard as a very weighty and decisive reason. It needs, however, little amplification. The bare statement of it is almost sufficient. Its truth and force are at once seen. The reality and character of these diverse tendencies of the two school systems, are perceived at a glance.

It is unnecessary to dwell upon the importance of assimilating the people of this country—of making

them one in character and in spirit, and of the value of institutions and influences for this end; of which educational institutions and influences are most practicable and powerful. This assimilation and unity of character and spirit are important in all nations, but especially in a nation politically free or self-governed, where all are equal in civil rights, where there are so many common privileges, duties and responsibilities, and where the sovereignty ultimately rests in the whole people. The value of educational institutions and influences, having this assimilating and uniting tendency, as have common schools eminently, can not be easily exaggerated in their relation to our native population, and especially in their relation to our immigrant population. As they come hither from all sections, nations and religions of Europe, it is important that their children should be neither uneducated, nor educated by themselves—that they find here educational institutions for the *whole* people, which will command their confidence, and secure the attendance of their children. The children of this country, of whatever parentage, should, not wholly, but to a certain extent, be *educated together*—be educated, not as Baptists, or Methodists, or Episcopilians, or Presbyterians; not as Roman Catholics or Protestants; still less as foreigners in language or spirit; but as Americans, as made of one blood, and citizens of the same free country—educated to be one harmonious people.

This, the common school system, if wisely and liberally conducted, is well fitted, in part at least, to accomplish. While it does not profess to give a complete education, and allows ample opportunity for instruction and training in denominational peculiarities elsewhere, it yet brings the children of all sects together, gives them, to a limited extent, a common or like education;

and, by such education, and by the commingling, acquaintance and fellowship which it involves, in the early, unprejudiced, and impressible periods of life, assimilates and unites them. And it is with serious regret that we see it recommended, and zealously urged, to substitute for this common school system, a system of dividing children into sectarian schools for the avowed purpose of teaching them sectarian peculiarities—a system which is fitted to lay deep in the impressible mind of childhood the foundations of divisions and alienations—a system well fitted to drive the children of foreigners, and especially of Roman Catholics, into clans by themselves, where ignorance and prejudice respecting the native population, and a spirit remote from the American, and hostile to the Protestant, will be fostered in them.

It is with great pleasure that we have witnessed, for some years, influences, and movements, fitted and intended to wear off the sharpness of sectarian distinctions; to open and reduce the walls of sectarian division; and to soften sectarian asperity—fitted to convince men that all truth and wisdom are not in their sect; to help them see whatever is excellent in other denominations; and to dispose them, while retaining an attachment to their own peculiarities, to place a paramount value upon the great truths in which all true Christians agree, and to unite in common enterprises and endeavors to promote the great objects of a common Christianity. And it is with mortification and impatience that we now see a movement virtually to subvert our common schools, so beneficent for purposes of unity and harmony, on the ground that they are not sufficiently sectarian—that they do not admit sectarian instruction—will not allow, as textbooks, the Westminster and Church (Episcopal) Catechisms. Must we, then, carry our sectarianism into

every thing? Can there not be one of the many spheres of educational influence, where all may meet as on common ground? Must our children be all distributed into denominational quarters, and shut up therein, for fear they will, for a few hours in the day, lack the teaching of our sectarian peculiarities? Is there nothing, not even a day-school, which we may undertake without the Westminster Catechism, or the Book of Common Prayer? Must we carry into every thing our sectarian manuals, and utter everywhere our sectarian shibboleths? Verily, we had been encouraged to hope for better things. Verily, this is a backward movement, a narrowing and belittling operation, in this age of growing Christian union and charity, which we vehemently dislike.

IV. The preceding course of argument fully evinces the duty of good citizens to sustain the common schools rather than introduce the church schools, provided the varieties of religious belief in our communities do not render any safe and valuable system of instruction in the former impracticable.

This brings us to the great, and, so far as appears, the only objection to the common school system—the religious objection. "If (say many) we must give up the teaching of our religious doctrines in common schools, then give us parochial schools. Deliver us from an irreligious education for the young." We have no doubt that some good and able men, not illiberal, or especially given to sectarianism, have by such views and feelings been led to look with favor on the church school movement. Our own state of mind was for a time such that we are enabled to appreciate their views and feelings. And if it had not been, their character and general aims would preclude us from speaking of them otherwise than with respect and affection. We feel entire confidence however, that a full inves-

tigation of the subject, a fair consideration of the views which have convinced us, will remove their anxieties concerning the common school system, and confirm them in its support.

To this objection we would give such consideration as the character of those who indulge it, and its relations to our subject require. And we express, at the outset, our strong conviction that, while many *theoretical* difficulties may easily be called up and set in array; yet if the several religious denominations will act with an enlightened public spirit, with an earnest desire for the promotion of the common weal by general education, and with the exercise of even a moderate degree of candor, liberality and courtesy toward each other, the *practical* difficulties will be found very few and small.

We begin by admitting in full, if necessary we will contend for, the principle, that, in common schools, schools under state and civil patronage, all religious denominations should stand on the same footing, should receive impartial treatment, and should all be protected from the invasion of their religious peculiarities. The opposite principle, which has been so extensively adopted in the discussion of this subject, that in this country the state or civil power is Christian and Protestant, and therefore that schools sustained and directed in part thereby are Christian and Protestant, and that whoever attends them has no right to object to a rule requiring all to study Christian and Protestant books and doctrines, we wholly disbelieve and deny. The state, the civil power in whatever form, in this country, is no more Protestant, or Christian, than it is Jewish, or Mohammedan. It is of no religion whatever. It is simply political, interposing, or having the right to interpose, in matters of religion, only by protecting its citizens in the free exercise of their religion whatever it be: of

course excepting such violations of civil rights, or civil morality, as any may commit under pretense, or a fanatical sense, of religion. If a company of Mohammedans should take up their residence in one of our New England towns, they would be entitled freely to build their mosque, and to exercise their worship therein; and entitled, also, as citizens, should they become citizens, to participate in the privileges of the common schools, on the same ground with others—entitled to the same consideration of their religious peculiarities, either by having a separate school or otherwise, which the peculiarities of other religious denominations receive. Such is the principle of our political institutions on this subject. And such it ought to be. This only is in accordance with that entire religious liberty which is recognized by the constitution of the United States. This only fully guarantees the rights of conscience, and the free, unconstrained exercise of private judgment in sacred things. This best promotes the general interests, religious as well as civil and social. And this alone accords with the *nature of true religion*; which is not and can not be exercised by a corporation or state as such, but only by individuals, acting in their several spheres, public and private—is not, and can not be a corporation or state affair, but an affair of the individual soul, between that soul on the one hand and God and men on the other. According to all just ideas of religion, a state religion is an absurdity, a self-contradiction.

Let us not be misunderstood. A majority of the people of this country are undoubtedly Christian and Protestant. And therefore, the country is properly called Christian and Protestant. Moreover, they who are chosen to enact and execute our laws are bound, under their responsibility as individual men, to be Christians, and to act in all their

public duties each under the influence of Christian principle. This truth can not be too thoroughly enforced and felt. But the state, as a state, is simply political—is of no religious denomination, or religion, whatever, any more than a bank or an insurance company—is such as to forbid the holding of its offices, and the performance of its duties, no more by infidels, Mohammedans, Jews or Roman Catholics, than by Christians and Protestants. It is, and ought to be, such that all political privileges and all civil advantages afforded thereby, are accessible and available to all alike of whatever religion. The sooner Christians, generally, understand and acknowledge this truth, the better—the better for their own satisfaction, comfort and hope, and the better for their influence on the general interests.

“This principle (some will say) is a strong reason with us for favoring church schools; for, whether it be true or not, we see that it is the principle, which, sooner or later, must in this country, if it does not now, govern our practice in common schools.” We say, however, that even on this principle, there will be no practical difficulty, if there be the exercise of a proper spirit of accommodation and liberality. This a brief examination of the matter will evince.

Before entering on this examination, it will be well to offer a preliminary observation.

Education in common schools is not, and is not designed to be, a *complete* education. The common school is not like a family school, in which the whole education and training of the child, or youth, for a period of its life, are designed and provided. It occupies the child, or youth, only for a few hours in the day; resigning it, for the remaining and greater part of the time, to other influence and training—that of home, the family, the *sanctuary*, the

Sabbath school, and society. So that, if, on the principle of division of labor, the common school should give no religious instruction whatever, but should confine itself to secular or merely intellectual education, it could not properly be said that its influence would be unfavorable to religion, much less that it would be irreligious or atheistic. And yet this often has been said. The opponents of state schools, and the advocates of sectarian schools, in England and in this country, have very laboriously and earnestly raised against common or state schools the cry, “a godless education,” “atheistic schools.” The Secretary of the Assembly’s Board of Education, (Rev. C. Van Rensselaer,) says in his last report to the Assembly, “The neglect of religious instruction in our schools, is doing more to nurture infidelity and immorality, than ever was in the power of Voltaire and Paine. \* \* \* Alas, how many children are *common schooled out of heaven!*” The italics are not ours. And one on the other side of the water, declares that “the education of these schools, as it does not include the positive religious element, a particular system of religious doctrine, is irreligious and atheistical.” Now this, surely, is very illogical, not to say narrow and bigoted. During from four to six hours out of the twenty-four, children receive instruction in common schools exclusively in the secular branches of education, reading, writing, arithmetic, history, &c., and during the other hours of the day and the whole of the Sabbath, are left to the religious instruction of parents and guardians, Sabbath school teachers and pastors, and to the influences of religious society and of the *sanctuary*; yet they receive a “godless education,” that secular instruction is “irreligious and atheistical,” and those children “are *common schooled out of heaven!*” Is this good logic, or good sense?

We fully admit, and if necessary, would strenuously contend, that, of a complete education, the religious instruction and influence is an essential part, and far the most important part; and that it should be given in all the periods of a child's life. Any educational institution therefore, which assumes for any considerable period, the *whole* education and training of a child or youth, like Girard College, or Dr. Arnold's Rugby School, or the many family schools in this country for boys or misses; and yet gives no religious instruction and training, is justly said to give an irreligious and godless education. But to say the same of a *day-school* which gives only secular instruction—instruction that does not discredit or interfere with, but prepares the way for and indirectly aids, religion, during only four or six hours in the day, avowedly leaving religious instruction to other and better teachers, is palpably illogical and unfair. What would be thought of a general application of such logic? A boy, who lives in his father's family, is employed six hours a day in a mechanic's manufactory, or in a merchant's store, or in a bank; but he receives, during those hours, no direct doctrinal or theological teaching; therefore that employment is irreligious, and the manufactory, the store and the bank are atheistic! A young man attends a course of chemical lectures; but in those lectures hears no theological or biblical teaching; therefore his chemical instruction is irreligious, and the chemical lectures are atheistic! A young man becomes a member of a medical school, or a law school; but he hears from the professors of medicine or law no theological instruction; therefore the medical school or the law school is irreligious and atheistic! Plainly in education, as well as in other things, there must be—certainly there *may* be—a division of labor; and secular teach-

ing may be the exclusive department—it must be the chief department—of the day-school; while religious teaching is provided in other and better ways. And religious teaching may be none the less religious, because it is not given by the individual who teaches reading, writing and arithmetic; and the teaching in the department of reading, writing and arithmetic, should not be accounted irreligious and atheistic because it is not conjoined or combined with theological teaching.

Let us now see how little difficulty the members of various religious denominations, and those of no religious denomination, will find in the practical working of common schools, if they will but unite in their support with a little magnanimity and charity, guarding against a disposition either to encroach or be jealous, and with earnest desire for the common weal.

We will suppose two plans, either of which might be adopted, or one in some places, and the other in other places, and consider the working of each—the plan of giving religious instruction in the schools, and the plan of giving secular instruction only, relying on other instrumentalities for the religious part of education.

Under the first plan there might be quite a variety of practice to suit the various opinions and feelings of different school districts. In a large proportion, we think a large majority, of those districts which would decide to have any religious instruction in their schools, the people would prefer the teaching of the fundamental Christian precepts, and of those fundamental Christian doctrines in which evangelical Protestant churches agree. Objections would be made, perhaps, here and there, to the teaching of those doctrines which are called, by way of distinction, orthodox or evangelical. In such cases there would be no objection to reading, or committing to memory,

the Holy Scriptures, and to teaching the scriptural morality and piety, as laid down in the ten commandments and the Christian precepts, and illustrated by the example of Jesus Christ. Very little jealousy has been encountered with regard to religious influence in the common schools of New England. Almost uniformly, in the country towns, the ministers of different denominations are the prominent members of the school committee and board of visitors; and they usually find no difficulty, when on their visits, in communicating whatever religious instruction, and in using whatever religious influence, their judgment approves.

If there should be districts, as probably there would be a few, in which the members of different religious denominations, not satisfied with the teaching of the common Christianity, should insist on the teaching of their distinctive doctrines, even so let it be. Let each scholar read or study his own Bible, and his own catechism. The pupils might, if it should be thought most convenient and wise, when the time for religious instruction arrived, be classified for this purpose—the Roman Catholics, with their Douay or Catholic version of the Bible, and catechism, in one class; the Episcopalians, with their Church of England catechism, in another; the Presbyterians or Congregationalists, with their catechisms, in another; and the Methodists and Baptists, with their doctrinal manuals, each in another; and if there should be other varieties, let them be classed accordingly. We think the working of this would be admirable. It would be a spectacle of unity in diversity, very pleasant to see. It would form an early habit of agreeing to disagree, and of respecting each the religious peculiarities and associations of the other, which, without danger, would tend greatly to charity and harmony in after life. We know that is practicable: for

we have seen it practiced for many years in a select school. We well recollect, that in our early days we attended, for many years, an excellent private school, in which, every Saturday forenoon, we received religious instruction on this elective affinity principle. We studied and recited our Westminster Catechism side by side with another who studied and recited the Church Catechism. And we well remember our boyish grievance in having so much the longest lesson.

Or, finally, if any districts should be found in which are some persons who insist on distinctively sectarian teaching in the school, and yet are afraid to have their children in the same room where the catechetical manuals of other sects are studied and recited; or some persons who object to any religious teaching at all, while others insist upon it; even these rare and extreme cases could be accommodated in this way—by having the direct religious teaching, by the school teacher, or by ministers of religion, confined to particular school hours; and leaving the attendance of children during those hours optional with their parents. This is the method recommended, in like cases, by Dr. Vaughan.

We will now consider the other plan—the plan of dispensing entirely with direct religious instruction in the common schools, and assigning that to other places and teaching—the plan which has our decided preference.\*

\* This is the plan preferred by that enlightened statesman, and excellent man, Lord Morpeth. "I am assuming that we can not attain that which I should myself prefer—that is, schools to which all should resort, and by which all should be benefitted in common, without distinction of sect or worship; to attain which desirable end I am ready, as I have stated to all the audiences I have addressed on the subject, to forego the giving of any special religious instruction in connection with the routine business of the school, and to

The adoption of this plan settles entirely the whole vexed question about sectarian religious teaching, by avoiding religious teaching altogether—a fact which decidedly recommends the plan, provided it can be practiced without detriment to religious interests. That it can, experience abundantly teaches. It is no new plan. It has been practiced, essentially, in the common schools of New England for thirty or forty years. There has been, probably, some variety in different districts. In a few, perhaps, the catechism has been taught, though we have known no such case within thirty years. Usually there has been no direct religious instruction, except when the school visitors, at the close of their examination, have made addresses to the children of a moral or religious character. It has been a common practice to read the Bible in classes, or in the whole school as one class. But this without note or comment can hardly be called religious instruction, and probably is, for religious purposes, worse than nothing, because of the irreverent and trifling associations thereby connected with that sacred book: and on this account it has, to our knowledge, been dispensed with by some excellent private teachers. So that we may say that the plan of giving no direct religious instruction, has, in its essential features, been practiced generally in the common schools of New England for thirty years. And yet we have not found that the children of New England have been "*common school-ed out of heaven.*" We have not found that this practice has "done more to nurture infidelity and immorality than ever was in the power of Voltaire or Paine." On the con-

trary, there is now much less of infidelity and immorality in New England than there was forty years ago. Nor have our most enlightened Christian men perceived, in the results of the practice, any detriment to religious interests.

There is, in our view, a manifest and great disadvantage in mixing up the teaching of sacred truths with the hurry, bustle, irksomeness, and restless roguery of a day-school. And there is, on the other hand, a manifest and great advantage in having such teaching by itself, where it can be approached with becoming seriousness, and linked with solemn and auxiliary associations. And therefore we prefer a division of labor in the work of education; assigning the department of secular instruction to day-schools, and that of direct religious instruction to other, and for the purpose better, instrumentalities—Sabbath school teachers, the sanctuary, pastors, the family, and especially parents. We would not have the responsibility of such teaching in any measure taken off from these instrumentalities, by the idea that such teaching is given in the day-school. Indeed, such teaching is chiefly provided, by judicious parents and guardians, through these other instrumentalities; and little reliance is placed by them on direct religious instruction in day-schools, even where it is given. We regard it as a calamity to encourage in any way the fallacious idea that direct religious instruction in a day-school is of much value, and can take the place, to any extent, of such instruction given elsewhere. The example and spirit, the insensible influence, of a truly pious teacher, we estimate very highly. Such a teacher will have an important religious influence on the pupils, though giving no doctrinal instruction: while, on the other hand, a teacher of an irreligious and trifling character, though teaching a catechism, or theology in out-

---

leave that to their own pastors, to their own parents, to the Sunday school, to their own sanctuaries, and to the no less precious altar of the family hearth."—*Speech of Lord Morpeth, at Wakefield, in August last.*

er forms, would have an influence far from salutary. We can not be too careful as to the personal character and influence of our teachers. But as to theological instruction, we can not ordinarily expect them to have the proper qualifications for it; nor have they, in a day-school, the proper place and time for it. It should be given, we prefer that children should receive it, in other places, and from better instructors.

The day-school is, indeed, a powerful auxiliary to religion, in the way of preparation. It teaches elementary knowledge, and gives the power of studying the Bible and other religious books. It disciplines the intellectual faculties. It disciplines the will, and the moral feelings. By a proper government, it teaches and necessitates subordination to superiors, subjugation of self-will and self-indulgence, regard for truth, control of the temper, industrious, patient and persevering application, and that reverence for the Deity and sacred things, and those universal principles of morals, in which all agree. In a word, the daily discipline of a school, and the incidental moral teaching it implies, work right principles into the minds of the pupils, and that in the permanent form of habits. So that the day-school is an important preparative and aid, to religious teaching. But its direct religious or doctrinal instruction, when attempted, is of very little value, if it is not, as we think it is on the whole, worse than nothing. Of course there are manifest and decided exceptions—in the case of teachers of peculiar piety, and competency for religious instruction. But this does not invalidate the general truth: which is attested by enlightened observation—the observation of those acquainted with private schools in which religious instruction is attempted, (for, as we have said, there has been almost none in our public schools,) and by the observation of those who

have been familiar with the national schools of Great Britain, where somewhat thorough religious teaching is required. Some testimony of this latter kind we will adduce.

The Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel, whom our readers know as an able and evangelical clergyman of the church of England, in a report, which, as an inspector of schools, he addressed to the Committee of Council on Education, after having spent two months in visiting 195 schools, writes thus—we have room for only a short extract.—“But it was in their understanding of the Scriptures, daily read, that I regretted to find the most advanced children of the national schools so extremely defective. Not only were they often ignorant of the principal facts recorded in the Bible, but they could not answer even the simplest questions upon the chapters which they had most recently read. Nor was their religious ignorance lessened by their knowledge of the catechism. I several times examined the first class upon a portion of the catechism, and I never once found them to comprehend it. \* \* \* Both in reading the Scriptures to the monitors, and in repeating the catechism, the children showed a marked inattention and weariness, occasionally varied, when the master’s eye was not on them, by tokens of roguish merriment. \* \* \*. Being thus made the medium through which reading and spelling are taught, it (the Bible) becomes associated in their minds with all the rebukes and punishments to which bad reading, or false spelling, or inattention in class exposes them; and it is well if being thus used for purposes never designed, it do not become permanently the symbol of all that is irksome and repulsive.”

Equally decisive, and more directly to the confirmation of our position, is the testimony of Dr. Vaughan.—“For our own part, we have always entertained a very low opin-

ion of the religious instruction given in day-schools, and of the religious impression produced by it. We have thought that a fuss has been made about it wonderfully greater than the thing itself would justify. It has reminded us too much of our Oxford religionists, who would pass for being very pious because prayers are read in the college chapel every morning. We admit most readily, that the training of a good day-school may *prepare* a young mind for receiving religious lessons with advantage from the lips of a parent, a Sunday school teacher, or a minister; but the man must have been a sorry observer of day-schools, who can regard the religious instruction obtained there as being, while existing alone, of any great value."\*

"But, while I believe many pious persons are most honest in their demands on this point, and while I admit that many teachers in daily schools do their best to give a religious cast to their instructions, I am still obliged to repeat, that I have a very humble opinion of the direct religious instruction which is given in day-schools, or that can ever be given in such institutions. Nor do I speak without experience on this subject. I have served more than one apprenticeship in the superintendence of schools on the British system, and the great benefit of such schools I have always found to consist, not in any direct religious impression produced by them, but in their adaptation to prepare the young for receiving religious instruction with advantage elsewhere. My experience, in this respect, must be, I feel assured, that of a great majority of persons who have been observant of the working of day-schools. In other departments, men soon become alive to the advantage of a division of labor; and why

should not popular education partake of benefit from such arrangements? Why might not one part of education be given by the school-master, another by the parent, by the minister of religion, or by the Sunday school teacher? Does religion cease to be a part of education, because not taught by the person who teaches reading and arithmetic? In fact, is there not danger that sacred things may lose something of their sacredness by being mixed up with the rough and often noisy routine of a day-school? One would think that to give religion a place apart after this manner, and to approach it with a special seriousness, would be to secure attention to it, only the more becoming and promising. Sure I am, there are many considerate and devout persons who would prefer such a method purely on account of its better religious tendency. Let the day-school inculcate a reverence of truth and justice, and a love of every thing kind, generous and noble-hearted, and let the directly religious instruction be grafted upon such teaching, and it will be the fault of the agents, and not of the method, if you do not realize a scheme of popular education of the highest value. Nor can I doubt that the intermixture of the children, of all sects, in such schools, would tend to abate our sectarian animosities, and render the next generation, in that respect, an improvement on the past."\*

Here we leave the subject. It is one in which we feel the deepest interest: for it is one, we believe, of great moment. We earnestly commend our reasonings and conclusions to public attention. They seem to us, not only true, but timely. There has been manifested, of late, a growing disposition to disonor and abandon our noble and be-

\* The British Quarterly Review, Vol. IV, p. 271.

\* Letter to the editor of the Morning Chronicle, on the question of popular education.

neficient system of common schools, and to substitute for it a system of sectarian schools, which must be inferior in character, and (what is more important) can not perform the work which common schools, when wisely and energetically administered, perform so well—the vital work of *general* education, of educating the *whole* people—a system, moreover, hostile to social and civil harmony. We can not but think that if the subject is fairly placed before the public mind, this movement will be arrested. We hope—perhaps it is hoping against hope—that our

Presbyterian brethren (old school) who have recommended and commenced the movement, will recede. Certainly we hope that no other denomination will follow their example. Far distant be the day—let it never come—when, in our beloved New England, the time-tested and time-honored common school system shall be abandoned, or weakened. Rather let renewed, persevering and united efforts be put forth to give it universally that perfection, of which it is capable, and which already, in many places, it has nearly attained.

#### REV. MR. BELLOW'S ON THE MORAL GOVERNMENT OF GOD.\*

The discourses which we have taken as the basis of our article, while severally of much significance, derive an additional interest from their relation to one another; a relation which we will at once proceed to explain.

The first is an ordination sermon by the Rev. H. Bellows, pastor of the church of the Divine Unity in the city of New York. It is chiefly remarkable for a very earnest, and very orthodox, exhibition of the object and efforts of the Christian minister. It commences with a notice of the charge made against Calvin and his school, of an inordinate

attachment to the epistolary and doctrinal portions of the New Testament. Against this charge Mr. Bellows offers a vindication, which, though by no means complete, indicates so just and candid a view of the subject, that we accept it with very sincere gratitude. He passes to a censure, equally just, in our opinion, of the somewhat vague and unsettled views of those who make this objection, and specifies their “want of a Christian theology,” as a serious deficiency. Entering thus upon his subject, he proceeds to consider the nature of the minister’s efforts, with reference to “the end, the obstacles, and the instrumentality.” So entirely is the sermon conformed to the views frequently cherished among ourselves, so exact is its coincidence of statement with a certain kind of evangelical preaching, that we despair of conveying any just view of it without larger extracts than our limits will allow. The *object* of the preacher he defines to be “a fixed and attainable change. It is a new heart that he is to create. His object is not so much to form the Christian

\* 1. *Relation of Christianity to Human Nature.*—A Sermon preached at the ordination of Mr. Frederick Knapp as colleague Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Brookline, Mass., on Wednesday, Oct. 6, 1847. Published by request of the Society. Boston.

2. *Nature of the Atonement.*—A Discourse delivered by appointment of the Synod of New York and New Jersey, on Wednesday evening, Oct. 20, 1847. By Rev. Thomas H. Skinner, Pastor of the Mercer Street Presbyterian Church, New York.

3. *Doctrine of the Atonement.*—The Christian Inquirer. New York.

character as to beget the Christian nature. His aim is the regeneration of man, not his development," &c. The grand *obstacle* to the sovereignty of God in the soul, he maintains to be a natural and hereditary depravity; a something lying back of human character, and for which, though not the result of any activity of ours, we are consciously and justly responsible. His statements under this head are somewhat remarkable, and fall short of the highest orthodoxy only in failing to affirm that man's depravity is *total*. He says, (p. 20,) "I fear, not to recognize an alienation of the natural man from God. I fear not to see a native proclivity to evil in man. I hesitate not to acknowledge the influence of hereditary depravity. Man is not only imperfect, prone to evil, certain to fall from perfect purity and obedience, by the very constitution of his original nature as Adam fell, but he is far more exposed by his constitutional relations to sinful progenitors, and his ordinary exposure to sinful parental and social influences anterior to his moral agency. Nay, further, I scruple not to acknowledge his accountableness for sin which he can not but commit," &c. This is certainly a very near approach to standard orthodoxy. We hesitate not to pronounce it after a highly approved pattern of sound undiscriminating and resolute orthodox assertion. These facts justify, in Mr. B.'s opinion, no objection to the purity or justice of God, unless we could "first establish the point that there are no provisions for strengthening this moral feebleness, and mending this *sinful bias*, and even turning them to the account of man's moral dignity and God's glory."

Admitting himself an extended scheme of such "provisions," he maintains that moral and physical evil sustain precisely the same relation to the divine government, are means alike of moral discipline to

men; and that consequently, to God, "there is no evil."

The instrumentality by which man's recovery is to be accomplished, is in earnest and extended phrases declared to be "Christianity," as the result of an indispensable divine interposition, "applied to human nature."

The discourse of Dr. Skinner, which we have placed second in order, was prepared and published by request of the Synod, to which it was preached. Our design does not permit us to examine it particularly; though we can not pass it by without some expression of our pleasure in the perusal of it. It is chaste, yet forcible in style, artistic and scholarlike in arrangement, and exceedingly just and vigorous in its reasonings. The view maintained in it exhibits the atonement, not as a satisfaction to any vindictory impulse of the divine nature, but as a measure rendered indispensable by the perfection of the divine character and government. The divine character being the grand security of the universe, requires the fullest manifestation. Where transgression has occurred, penalty is ordinarily the indispensable means of this manifestation; and if penalty be systematically borne, some measure which may equally illustrate the emotions and purposes of God towards sin, becomes of the highest necessity. It ought perhaps to be observed, however, that the operation of a retributive sentiment in the infliction of literal punishment, the discourse nowhere denies; it is only in reference to a substituted sufferer that Dr. S. questions its influence. With this limitation, we deem his argument upon the subject altogether correct. The discourse, after presenting this view in a most distinct and discriminating manner, discusses briefly, but decisively, the whole body of the current objections to the doctrine, and concludes with an emphatic rebuke,

of the sin which either despises or denies it. On the whole, we know not where to find in the same brief compass, an account of the philosophical grounds on which the revealed fact of the atonement rests, which is at the same time so eloquent and so conclusive as this.

No. 3, is an unfinished series of essays on the same subject, in the columns of the *Christian Inquirer*, (a Unitarian paper in the city of New York,) from the pen of Rev. Mr. Bellows, its editor. In connection with a review of the sermon last mentioned, Mr. B. here unfolds his conception of the divine government, and of the relations which sin sustains to it; and it is to the system of thought here developed, that we wish more particularly to call attention.

These articles, five in number, are somewhat diffuse, and the several topics of thought and argument are not formally and prominently indicated. We are obliged, therefore, to select for ourselves from the body of each article, such statements as seem to us of the most significance; a circumstance which must be our excuse, should Mr. B. think that we fail to give a just exhibition of his views.

In the first number he develops the Unitarian theory of the atonement, (disclaiming that name, however,) that man is reconciled to God by the influence of the life, love, and teachings of Christ. In the second, he attributes to the evangelical view of the atonement an influence of a highly salutary kind in the past history of the church; but thinks that he can accept "all that is permanent and evangelical in the doctrine," while he "rejects the theological theory which has handed it down to us." In the third, he enters upon an examination of Dr. S.'s sermon, and freely admits that the doctrine, as here presented, "is free from many or most of the objections commonly urged against it."

It gives us pleasure to record these frank and conciliating statements, and to express our appreciation of the manliness and courtesy in which Mr. B. has taken as the basis of his remarks, a form of the doctrine which we deem so elevated and unexceptionable. Nor are we without hope that the doctrine may yet come to stand above the only objection which he distinctly presents, viz., that the divine nature is incapable of suffering. This assumption, we can not but consider utterly repugnant to that most unquestioned of Unitarian principles, that the divine benevolence forbids the final misery of the wicked. For, such misery can cause no pain to a being who is not susceptible of pain; and if infinite benevolence would not be pained by it, it is difficult to see on what grounds exception can be taken to the infliction. Any repugnance of our sympathies must, in that case, be referred to the fact that our capacities are finite, and will, of course, diminish in proportion as we expand into the likeness of the ever blessed God. The two principles can not by any ingenuity be woven into the same scheme. If God is not susceptible of suffering, all objection to everlasting punishment, which is derived from the divine benevolence, falls to the ground; if He is, the only objection which Mr. B. deems it worth while to urge against our views of the atonement, is swept away.

In the remaining articles of the series, Mr. B. exhibits at large his conception of the divine government, and aims to present one which, while philosophical and just in itself, shall dispense with all necessity of an atonement. The foundation of the system is laid in the universality of the divine purposes. "We conceive," he says, "that the creation, history and destiny of the race of man, is a whole; having no accidents, exigencies, or unforeseen, or unprovided for, circumstances be-

longing to it." "Taking this view of the matter we have no objection to the doctrine of Adam's fall, nor to the supposition of the fall of the race in Adam, because it connects itself, in our view, directly with the rise of the race in Christ, as in Adam all die, &c. Nor do we see any philosophical or moral difficulty in the representative character Adam is made to assume. \* \* \* His acts may be considered fitly as the acts of the race, that is, in his place any other member of the race would have acted as he did. \* \* \* He illustrated the fact of human imperfection and weakness ; the fact that in the order of God's providence the race was to win its way to glory and happiness through the woful experience of transgression ; the fact that *sia was to become a great agency in the moral development of the human race.*"

Sin is abundantly declared to have entered into the divine plan, not as an undesirable element, but as the indispensable means of our moral culture. Of course the idea of any proper abhorrence and punishment of it, on the part of the Creator, is out of the question : and the divine government, becomes simply a scheme of moral development and education. Thus, Mr. B. maintains that "in the fall," our first parents "entered upon that experience which is strictly human and upon which our nature was *originally framed to depend* for its culture and true progress." "Christ came, \* \* not to enable God to do what his attributes would not allow him to do before ; but to become the instrument through which the Almighty might carry on, to its completion, a work of moral and spiritual education, always in his purpose and *always in process.*" He maintains that "theologians have too generally proceeded on the supposition that the moral government of God was characteristically a penal government ;" and proceeds to show

that the value of any government must depend on its efficacy as a means of moral illumination ; and its strength, upon the hold it gains on the affections of its subjects by its inculcations of truth, and manifestations of goodness toward them. So high is his estimate of the illuminating influence of moral law, that even where it demands action which surpasses all our capacity of obedience, its imposition is not unjust ; "its unequalness in respect of human power being balanced by its blessedness in respect of human education." Man being thus naturally unable to obey, the law could not have been designed to secure his obedience, but only his education ; and consequently disobedience can not in justice be made the ground of any very serious procedure. "If we any where find," says Mr. B., "that the law which was unto death, was allowed to terminate in death ; or that man's *exposure to ruin* was permitted to be realized ; if man *proving in all cases incapable of keeping the law*, and therefore failing under the shadow of its penalties, was left to fall under the actual substance of them—then would be the time to complain."

Before proceeding to any argument upon the views thus presented, we would call the attention of our readers to the grand features of the system. Moral development, "the moral dignity of man and the glory of God," the comprehensive object of the divine administration ; of this, *SIN the indispensable means* ; sin, therefore, no real evil ; and consequently, no need of any stonement for it, and no justice in the everlasting punishment of it. Then too, the race in Adam ; sharing his fall, and becoming responsible for "dispositions opposed to goodness which we may have inherited, and can not wholly, and at all times, resist," moral responsibility therefore, and the whole government of God indeed, a mere apparatus of "illu-

mination ;" in which "all the experiences of the race are *absolutely essential* to the end ever kept in view ;" and hence, the fall and its consequences, as Mr. B. distinctly announces, not to be "deplored!" We ask our readers, here particularly to mark the orthodox principles of theology on which these wide and terrible departures from evangelical truth are justifying themselves. We beg them to consider, whether those principles do not logically necessitate the melancholy and dangerous issues they have reached ; and whether it is not time for all, who love the truth as it is in Jesus, to make up their minds to an earnest, and if possible discriminating, repudiation of principles, liable to such pernicious abuse. To us, it is no small satisfaction, that it is not our view of the government of God, which furnishes to Unitarian error the foundation which it deems more sure than any it can itself originate ; and for which in consequence, it seems now disposed to abandon every other.

Our first inquiry, in reference to this attempt to harmonize the existence of evil with the character of God, respects the extent to which this vindication of evil may with propriety, and must with consistency be carried. If Adam's sin is, after all, not to be deplored, we would ask whether it stands distinguished in this respect, from other acts of disobedience, or whether Adam's subsequent transgressions, and those of his posterity, all fall within the same category with the first. For ourselves, we discern no reason why they may not, and must not, be viewed alike. Supposing the moral consequences of the fall to be really evil, we can not see that the immensity of this evil at all hallows or sanctifies the act of the apostasy. Supposing them not to be really evil, we can not see why those consequences, or any one of them, should be deplored, or regretted. The ar-

guments adduced in support of Mr. Bellows's theory, seem to us absolutely to require this extension of it. For, if the fact, that God from the beginning foresaw and foreordained the sin of Adam, lends any palliation to that act, it does so equally to the sin of David—of Peter—of Judas—in short to all sin. For all sin is foreseen and foreordained by the Divine Mind as truly as was that of Eden. If Adam's sin has been made the occasion of valuable discipline to himself and his posterity, so has that of David. So has all our experience of moral evil. Who does not hold that all sin is made in some way, and in some degree, to promote the glory of God, and the moral development of man? Plainly in these respects all sin stands upon the same ground ; it enters into the same plan, and for the same reasons, with the sin of Adam ; and if that sin affords no occasion of regret, the result in respect to all sin, is very obvious and very significant.

How far Mr. B. would be disposed to acquiesce in our effort to press this principle to its logical results, we are unable to say. It is but due to him to state, that he speaks in his sermon of the "heinousness"—and the "desolation" of sin ; exhibits its character as evil in the most emphatic terms—speaks of the natural mind as "above all, a mind to which sin is not the deadliest and most dreaded of evils,"—terms actual alienation from God "a dreadful thing," &c. &c. Indeed the strength of his expressions on this point, it would be difficult for the most orthodox believer in the evangelical scheme to surpass. But then we find it quite as expressly laid down that in this universe where sin has so wide a sway, "there is no evil" in the sight of God. "It is equally true that *to him THERE IS NO EVIL.*" \* \* \* And who does not see that to our judgment the Almighty is always justified *by his purpose?* This is our only means of reconcil-

ling the physical evil in the world with the perfect benevolence of God. But what reason have we for making an exception as it respects moral evil? Why may not human nature and *human character* fall under the law to which all the other creations and purposes of God are held—the law by which the imperfect precedes the perfect; the worse the better?"

That these two classes of passages are totally irreconcilable with one another, our readers will scarce need to be told. Indeed if it had been the object of Mr. B. to frame statements which *should* be so, he could scarcely have done it more effectually. While he maintains, doubtless in all sincerity, that "sin is the deadliest and most dreaded of evils," he tells us that to God "there is no evil" in it. While he pronounces "actual alienation from God a dreadful thing wholly independent of the causes of it," (Sermon, p. 16,) he also says, (Essay, No. III,) "Adam's fall—or, what is an equivalent expression, the uniform experience of the race in sin; the uniform exposure of the race to suffering; the *uniform alienation* of the race *from God*; the uniform need of repentance and forgiveness, is a part of God's moral government of which we recognize the fitness, beauty and necessity," &c. &c. How alienation from God can be a dreadful thing, while it has yet "fitness and beauty and necessity" as a part of God's government;—how sin can be the deadliest of evils while yet to God "there is no evil," passes all understanding. It is perfectly evident however that Mr. B. is not aware of any inconsistency between these two classes of statements. We think therefore that we can hardly be in error in supposing, that the subject of the atonement in its relations to the government of God, is a new one to him; and that he has thrown out these expressions, without observing whither they tend. We would be far therefore from im-

pating to him any of the consequences which seem to be most obviously and indisputably to flow from the principles he here upholds. If the sin of Adam is not to be deplored;—if sin is really a means of moral discipline, which occupies the same relation to the divine character and purposes as physical pain;—if the alienation of a soul from God has in it a fitness and beauty as a necessary part of its moral development;—the conclusion follows irresistibly, that there is no such thing as guilt or blameworthiness possible among men. Who can assign or discern any reason for avoiding sin, any ground to regret or "deplore" sin, any obligation to repent of sin, or indeed any possibility of repentance, when once it is fully admitted that sin is a great agency in our moral development, in which omniscience perceives no evil? These expressions go evidently to such an extreme length, that we are unwilling to suppose that Mr. Bellows really adopts or understands the conclusions which his language necessarily implies. And yet it is not his language alone that suggests them; the whole scope of his reasonings in respect to the divine administration, irresistibly leads to the same issues. The dogma that sin, when viewed by a mind competent to discern all its relations and results in the present scheme, is no real evil, this seems the foundation of his philosophy. This is with him the reason why the sin of Adam is not to be deplored; to us it is, if true, a reason why it was on the whole better that sin should occur than not. Evidently it is a reason which, could Adam but have known the whole truth, would have justified his transgression; and which we most seriously believe would justify all transgression. Indeed Mr. B. seems very distinctly to place Adam's sin and its consequences on the same ground;—"if we be asked, do we not deplore Adam's fall and the

consequences of it, we are compelled to say in the distinctest manner, No! We conceive it to have been as necessary and indispensable a part of the history of the race, and the moral development of the race, as the legislation of Moses, or the mission of Christ." This unguarded language we will not hold up to any reproach, for we are persuaded that Mr. B. would not deliberately maintain it in the face of the consequences which we here charge upon it. The subject is to him evidently a novel one, and looking at it from only a single point of view, he has thrown out expressions which deprive sin of all its heinousness, and do all that philosophical principles can, to reconcile conscience to the depravity which exists within us.

The reason for God's permission and foreordination of evil, has been, to every earnest student of His moral government, a theme of anxious inquiry. As a topic which stands related to every great truth, and every great error, in the philosophy of religion, it has been discussed by the leading divines of the Calvinistic body with an earnestness proportioned to its importance: and never more earnestly, never more ably, never we believe with happier results, than in the recent controversies which have agitated the evangelical body in New England. The theory that 'sin is the necessary means of the greatest good,' after having been warmly and ably defended, has at length been formally abandoned by all parties among us. No one now proposes to defend or professes to hold it. This theory it seems the design of Mr. Bellows to bring forward once more. His view of it differs only in a single unessential particular, from that of the champions of this past form of Calvinism. They deemed the greatest good to consist, in the fullest exhibition of the divine perfections; he places it in the fullest development of man's capacities. Neither of

these objects is held, in either scheme, in total exclusion of the other; but the one gives prominence to the manifestation of God, the other to the development of man. They supposed that sin furnished an indispensable occasion for the display of punitive justice and forgiving mercy; he deems it an indispensable element of the moral development of man. With this difference in respect to the end of the divine government, the existence of moral evil is vindicated, on both schemes of thought, on grounds absolutely identical; it is indispensable to the perfection of God's administration—"the necessary means of the greatest good," in each.\*

The theory will be therefore to most of our Calvinistic readers, an entirely familiar one. It has been with us a theme of earnest inquiry and debate; and we have learned to regard it, even when presented in connection with our own scheme of doctrine, as one fraught with conclusions of the most pernicious and repulsive kind. At the same time, it stands, in the orthodox system, in relations which go far to counteract its demoralizing tendencies. Viewed in the light which the atonement on the one hand, and the doctrine of everlasting punishment on the other, cast upon it, there seems such a terrible earnestness in the divine prohibitions of sin, as tends power-

\* Should any of our readers be under the impression that the phrase which thus describes sin, is of recent origin, and is un sanctioned by the standard theological writers of New England, they will perhaps be grateful to us for a reference which will enable them to correct the error. From Dr. Stephen West's *Essay on Moral Agency*, (p. 178,) we copy the following expressions: "These things being considered, it may perhaps appear that the existence of moral evil is a necessary means of the greatest good;" \*\*\* "it most certainly follows that moral evil was a necessary means of the greatest good." See Part II, sec. i, for numerous expressions of the same kind, in every variety of phraseology.

fully to restrain the mind from venturing any thing upon a theory which pronounces it, in His sight no evil. But upon a scheme which denies *both* those truths, the dogma must sweep to its conclusions, with a force which bodes little of good to any interest of piety or truth or morality among men.

We will not therefore enter upon any extended argument against this theory, till we know whether our author is disposed to maintain it, in full view of its logical consequences. The fact that he nowhere notices, or promises to notice, the grave objection we urge, confirms us in the impression that he has uttered these sentiments in haste and inadvertence. He will perhaps allow us to inquire, how far he would acquiesce in the extension which we have felt constrained to give to the reasonings by which he vindicates the apostasy; and whether he is prepared to take issue with "those of his orthodox brethren for whose opinions he has the most respect," on the question of the indispensableness of sin to the perfection of the divine government. For purposes of controversy merely, nothing could be more favorable to our cause, than that Unitarianism should place itself before the public on ground which we have explored so thoroughly, and the disadvantages of which we understand so well; but loving victory less than truth, we should sincerely regret to find our opponents borrowing from Calvinism only its errors and its reproach.

In the high appreciation which Mr. Bellows entertains of the educational influences of the divine government, it gives us pleasure to express a cordial agreement. We can not think however that his analysis of them is a very correct one; or that he places any just estimate upon the relative power of the several elements. He says that "it is not intended to deny all moral effi-

cacy or illumination to penal law. We see that the announcement of a penalty is the passing of a moral judgment on the offense, and that thus penal law has an educating influence upon a community." (No. V.) Now we can not think that this scanty concession does any justice to the vast educating influence of simple law. Mr. B. treats the question as though penal law depended for its power, upon the appeal it makes to fear: as though it were a question of the relative influence of love and fear. He speaks of "degrading fear, selfish hope, and servile submission," as though these were the great sentiments which law addresses, though he would not "deny all" illuminating power to it. Far other than this is our estimate of its influence. While we can not admit that either the *fear* of God, or the *hope* of heaven, is altogether a base, or altogether an insignificant thing, there are so many other active impulses of nature to which the law of heaven makes its appeal, (and which Mr. B. seems almost entirely to have overlooked,) that the question might be argued upon these alone.

1. First; apart from all consideration of the relative power of different impulses *when called into action*, there is in the instinct of self-preservation a tendency to act which belongs to no other. Other impulses, such as love, and gratitude, whatever their power when excited, require a far greater amount of thought and reflection to stimulate them to action than this; inattention, therefore, is fatal to any thing which depends upon their influence. So it would be in this case, but the same inattention to our own wants as to those of others, is not possible. A man suffers his benefactor to starve in the street, not because his avarice is stronger than gratitude, but from mere thoughtlessness of the other's necessities. A man who would really sacrifice much for his

friend neglects an opportunity which may never return, of rendering him most essential service, simply from inattention; but he is never so inattentive to his own interests. There is no question in these cases of the relative strength of the impulses concerned; but every one sees that the one acts only upon reflection and the other instinctively. The certainty and rapidity, therefore, with which the one comes into action give it an advantage of a peculiar kind, quite apart from its relative strength. While our moral vision is so feeble, the tendencies of our acts so obscure, and their consequences so remote, not to say uncertain, who does not see the advantage of a law, which makes its distinct and impressive appeal to an impulse so sure and prompt as this?

2. Secondly; it is no question of the *relative* power of love and fear, which our idea of the divine government raises. While we maintain the necessity of penal inflictions for the support of authority when sin has occurred, we conceive of no authority as worthy of one moment's respect, which has not its foundation in the purest and most benevolent affection. Why may not God, while he proclaims the dread penalty of his law, and feels himself shut up to the necessity of its infliction, first, place the creatures whom he assumes to govern, in a scene where each object of nature, and each hour of life, shall speak of his boundless goodness? Why may not beings, over whose heads this mighty institute extends in all its solemnity, find each necessity of their natures kindly cared for—each sense an inlet of calm enjoyment—each several faculty a separate world of blessing—till each circumstance of their existence shall become a radiant testimony of their Creator's love? What hinders that the ministry of angels should attend upon, and instruct them? that God himself should visit and commune

VOL. VI.

88

with them; and folding each soul thus placed on its probation to his paternal bosom breathe words of highest wisdom, and of deepest affection? Nay, what is all this but a faint picture of what actually took place in Eden? Our scheme is compatible, therefore, with every influence both of kindness, and of instruction, which could be devised to bless men while innocent, in any other; and to say that guilt constitutes no obstacle to the manifestation of love, is to assume that sin is no real evil—a principle which would deprave both the universe and its ruler, precisely in proportion to the earnestness with which they act upon it. Mr. B. speaks of "love and love's efforts to instruct and enlighten," &c. What love, and what instruction, are there within the compass of thought, like those which grow out of the dread necessity which we acknowledge?—the love to which we owe "the unspeakable gift," and the instruction which radiates from the cross of Christ?

3. But one of the grandest influences of legal penalty lies in the powerful stimulus which it affords to our intellectual faculties. In this respect it far surpasses every other conceivable. The stern threatening of an overwhelming infliction, as the inevitable consequence of transgression, appeals not first, nor principally to the sentiment of fear. Its first effect is to awaken wonder and surprise. The impressive denunciation of sin as the supreme evil, rouses each faculty of reason and reflection to discover those relations and consequences of sin which render it, to infinite wisdom and love, the object of such intense displeasure. How dire its influence on the soul itself; how dread its devastations in the divine government, to call for a counteraction so vigorous and extreme! Following those significant indications which the law holds forth, the mind goes forward into the interminable future—upward

to the far throne of the Most High—down into the deep recesses of its own nature—abroad into each unexplored field of thought, grasping with each movement, more and more of the vastness of the relations which unite it to God and his kingdom. The evil—the *real* evil—of sin—the excellence of the law—the value of obedience—the awful beauty of holiness—become subjects of earnest and familiar thought, till they stand disclosed in all their glory to its view. And now, what educating process is there, we would ask, to be named in comparison with that which yields this mighty stimulus to our intellectual nature. Love calls forth simply love in return; mercy awakens only the emotion of gratitude. What sentiment of those on which Mr. B. relies, awakens curiosity—stimulates imagination—absorbs attention—constrains thought—like this high institute of law?

4. Nor is this all. It is only upon the scheme we advocate, that the influence even of instruction assumes at all a commanding character. For what more can instruction do in its highest forms, than disclose *those tendencies* by which sin and holiness degrade or exalt the soul? What more can it do in respect to sin than to show that it tends to prevent all the beautiful development of our nature—enslave us to base impulses—fill us with shame and remorse—and work thus our utter ruin? Will it be said that all this, fully disclosed, is enough? True, if it be effectually taught: but observe the defect of the teaching. While we see these to be the *tendencies* of sin, we see also many an instance of sin in which they do not actually or perceptibly follow. Sin *tends* to overwhelm the soul with remorse; but the man whose hands are red with murder, lies down and his sleep is sweet. "Human nature and human circumstances," says Mr. B., "are all contrived to throw honor and peace upon

moral worth, and final contempt and wretchedness upon unworthiness." It is most true: but what certainty is there that they will *actually* accomplish the work they were "contrived" to do? How much honor and peace did they throw round the life of Paul, or of his master? How often does crime walk unblushing through the land, and make its way to the high places of influence and honor! We admit the tendency; and this, instruction may develop; but why may not skill, and resolution, and daring, set tendencies at defiance hereafter, as they do here, and cheat beholders into sympathy and admiration? Nothing, evidently, save that pledge of the Infinite Ruler, which constitutes the threatening of penalty, can relieve them of their aspect of doubtfulness, and give them place and influence among the realities of our future existence.

On these grounds, then, apart from all consideration of the relative influence of love and fear, we base our argument, and maintain that in the active nature of the sentiments to which it appeals, in its compatibility with every other influence of wisdom and of love, in the intellectual stimulus it furnishes, and in the certainty with which it invests the general tendencies of things, the institute of penal law finds a power which surpasses immeasurably that of any other scheme; one which stamps it, beyond mistake, *chief* among all the ways of God in his moral intercourse with men. On the other hand, against Mr. Bellows's scheme, lie several conclusive objections.

First, it is not a *government* at all. Government holds an influence of authority and control over men; this *professes* to be only a scheme of instruction. It is a mere educational institute in the form of a government. The parent who guides the hand of his infant to a physical object, and *instructs* it thus in the nature and qualities of this object,

when he would not yet venture to give a command, recognizes the wide distinction between the influences of authority and instruction. This system is one of illumination simply and purely. Its law was framed with reference to our capacities of education, not of obedience. It is promulgated with a real design and preference of transgression, for the sake of the invaluable discipline of which sin is to be the means. Its penalty is threatened with no intention of inflicting it; and if it were inflicted would give occasion to "complain." He who falls under its condemnation, falls under what Mr. B. most appropriately terms "a shadow." Who can fail to see that this professed government is an unreal thing in every particular; a mere illuminating apparatus, borrowing for its more efficient operation the forms of law?

Next; not being a government in fact, it fails entirely to secure the educational influences of one. What influences of this kind it formally repudiates, we have already seen. For the rest, its law has not even the power of "a moral judgment" upon transgression, because it is not a transcript of the real will of the lawgiver, who originally designed its violation. Its influence, too, of kindness and love, what obstacle can these throw in the way of sin, when once it is understood that the lawgiver originally framed our nature to depend upon sin for its "culture and true progress," and of course that he really prefers it? It is not, therefore, a government operating by the influence of authority, nor yet a government operating by the influence of instruction and kindness; for the reason that it is not a government at all. It is a mere institute of education.

Its value for purposes of this nature, must depend on the simple value of the truths it has to teach; and what, we ask, is the comprehensive lesson which the system it-

self and the experience of all its subjects is ever exemplifying? Why plainly, that in the view of Omnipotence "there is no evil" in sin, and that God's law was not designed to prevent, but rather to secure it as "a grand agency in the moral development of our race." What an invaluable education the divine government will have furnished, and on what a hopeful career it will be entering, when each of its subjects having become sufficiently "illuminated," shall begin to act on the sublime principles on which the government itself proceeds, that on a really comprehensive view of the matter, there is no evil in sin!

By a misapprehension, which seems to us somewhat extraordinary, Mr. B. supposes that upon our theory, "human history, and all that we now view as human life, a scene of probation, of temptation, or trial, is a grand perversion of the divine plan;" that is, that a system of probation was not the one originally designed for man during his abode on earth. All ideas of this kind, however, we entirely disclaim. The only question between us at this point is, not whether a moral being requires a process of discipline in order to the development and confirmation of his character; but whether sin is an indispensable element in such a process. Here is the whole difference. Man's residence on earth was designed for trial, but not for sin.

Let us suppose, then, (to exhibit our own view of the subject,) that in the simple trial to which his piety was first subjected, Adam had held fast his integrity; and that when this obedience had become habitual, the sphere of his moral responsibility had been enlarged by other prohibitions. Let us suppose a series of such stages, each broader than the preceding, successfully traversed, till the moral affections, at first almost powerless to resist temptation, had grown into impulses of

such promptness and vigor as made them the controlling impulses of his nature. In the mean time his posterity would have come into being under influences far transcending any that our world now knows. The serene piety of a parent in habitual intercourse with the spiritual world—in daily communion with a visible divinity, would have been from the first stamping its celestial image upon the immortal nature yielded to its affection, and entrusted to its care.

The infant piety of beings upon whom neither the fall nor the curse had wrought its deadly work, would have begun soon to emulate parental devotion. As the race multiplied, social duties had tried obedience, and social intercourse had given culture to affection. A piety lovelier and stronger than any the earth has seen, had been developed and tested under nobler institutes. Plans to prolong this reign of righteousness through all the ages—efforts to bind the present and the future yet closer to heaven, had given scope to the highest faculties, and tested man's faithfulness to his mighty charge. Thus had man lived in dignity and simplicity, striven in hope and devotion for posterity and for God, and awaited in tranquil, joyful expectation, the hour when his sanctified character should gain such maturity in holiness as earth could give. And then how had the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof, borne him away, not through the gloom and decay at which nature now shudders, but through the blue heaven above us to scenes where yet more of God should be disclosed to his adoring view!

But it may be asked, if such results of beauty and glory were foreseen as consequent upon Adam's obedience, why did not a benevolent Creator interpose to secure it? Why not sustain this frail and unstable virtue till the tremendous cri-

sis should be past? Because, we reply, it is entirely possible that such interposition would have defeated its own end, and deprived the being to whom it was vouchsafed of all the benefit of the trial. It is entirely possible that these momentous results might depend upon Adam's *spontaneous* obedience. If so, the idea of divine interposition is precluded by the very supposition; and the fact that it did not take place, furnishes no argument against the theory that obedience on his part would have opened to our world such a career of moral beauty and blessedness as we have aimed to describe.

Will it be said that the earth was not adapted, even before the fall, to be the theater of such events? The objection lacks proof; but if it did not, the answer is easy; the earth was formed in foresight of the fall, and adapted substantially to the state of things arising from it.

Is it deemed fanciful to lodge a capacity of such mighty results in the individual bosom in which the race took its origin? Nay, it is not fanciful. What else is all human history than the record of men who have thus molded posterity into their own image. What else than this, in a somewhat humbler degree, was the life of Abraham? of Moses? of Paul? of Bunyan? of Wesley? And if here, and now, the generation wait to receive religious character at the hand of one regenerate soul that is instinct with the life of God, why should it be deemed "puerile" to attribute even these results to holiness such as we have described, enthroned, like the angel standing in the sun, in that bosom from which our nature took its origin and its type.

Least of all can such an objection be urged by those with whom we hold this argument. They deem it not visionary to attribute all the efficient moral influences which now adorn and bless our being, to an

origin precisely similar. To what but the sanctifying influences which grow out of the single life of Jesus, do they attribute all that has elevated our nature in the past? all that promises further elevation in the future? And if the obedience of one man, amid all human corruption, holds so efficient a recuperative influence over the race forever, why need we shrink from attributing a similar efficiency of preservation to the obedience of our first ancestor? Surely they who find such reclaiming efficacy in the life of the second Adam, may not forbid us to suppose that the sinless life of the first would have wrought those immeasurable results of blessing which the evangelical faith ascribes to it.

The principle on which these discussions of Mr. Bellows proceed, seems evidently to be, that the experience of sin affords to a moral being an element of useful culture. We have heard the idea from other sources. For ourselves, we discern not the smallest argument to relieve it of the repulsive aspect in which it must present itself to a mind of any religious sensibility. On the contrary, it seems at utter variance with much of our most familiar experience. What valuable discipline have we ever derived from this unclean source? What benefit accrues to our voluntary faculty from having learned to act in defiance of all truth and all authority? What improvement do the fine sensibilities of our nature derive from having been accustomed to pass by all that is grand and ennobling, and fasten on despicable and impure things? What conceivable addition is made to our intellectual wealth, or our intellectual power, by acts the very essence of which is to cast contempt upon all true wisdom? The whole tendency is plainly in the opposite direction, to stultify and base the mind.

So far is this idea from the truth, that in fact we have no reason to

conclude that even the glorious influences of this redemptive system can ever entirely counteract the pernicious effects of sin. Who shall say that a soul long subjected to a process which tends powerfully to enfeeble it in all those elements of its nature which must constitute the strength of holy principle, will ever secure the harmonious and vigorous development of a perfectly sinless being. Who shall say that this protracted and extreme conflict with evil will not leave scars to mar the beauty, and wounds to impair the efficiency, even of those who are victorious in it; as the ordeal by fire, of old, left its ineffaceable marks in the scathed and callous flesh of those who successfully endured it.

Still farther; it may be alledged as a decisive fact of consciousness, that all the discipline we are conscious of having received, has been gained not only without the aid of sin, but in actual and vigorous opposition to all that would lead to it. It is in resisting temptation, not in yielding to it, that the soul confirms itself in good. It is the great law of our nature that affections and impulses of whatever kind grow by acting, not by being trampled on. Benevolence strengthens with each act it is allowed to dictate, and diminishes in power on each occasion that it is overruled and suppressed by selfish or covetous passion. Ambition towers higher and stands stronger with each victory that it gains over the love of justice or the sense of duty. It is not therefore by sinning that the soul ever gains the least of the valuable discipline which this probationary scene furnishes. Transgression tends only to future weakness and blindness: leaves only a mist before the eye and a palsy upon the arm of him who ventures beyond the sphere which wisdom and love assign as ours. All the development which the present system affords, is due to

*trial, not to sin.* “ We count them blessed which endure.” How entirely would sin have destroyed the beneficent results of a trial like that of Abraham; and become an occasion of everlasting regret!

But it is the life of Christ which lends the highest confirmation to the view we advocate. On the theory of those with whom we argue, here was the passage of a purely human being through this world utterly unstained with sin. And who will stand up to maintain that his affectionate and ingenuous childhood,—his thoughtful and auspicious youth,—his lovely and most perfect manhood, had been improved in aught that lends beauty or dignity to human character by the smallest experience of moral evil? It were ignominious to say it. Yet he shared each simple impulse of our common nature, and “ was tempted in all points like as we are;” that he who would hold up before his mind the highest ideal of moral discipline and its benign results, might see that in all that process of culture which thus sanctifies and adorns our nature, sin has literally *no* part. Who that compares regenerate character in the fairest forms it assumes among men, with the character of Christ, can fail to see that, precious as are the spiritual economies which surround us in this system of fall and redemption, they fail utterly to elevate human character to any thing like that eminence of glory, to which it might have attained? Who can fail to see in the light of such an example, that sin only deforms our nature, only obstructs its fair and fine development, and causes the education which abounding grace yet achieves, to advance toward perfection with a slow and halting movement, and reach it at last on a far lower level, than that on which un fallen nature might have sped its rapid and graceful course to the same bright goal. Indeed there are to us few aspects of the incarnation

so interesting, as that which exhibits Deity assuming our nature, and guarding it from all corrupting contact with the evil which is in the world, *for the purpose* of showing to the race and the universe, a specimen of what human nature was “ originally framed” to be;—and thus, of manifesting the value of the original law of holiness, the earnestness with which that law was given, and the odiousness in every aspect of the sin which has caused actual human nature, even in the glory of its redeemed state, to fall so far below the divine ideal of it.

That system of influences then, under which our nature receives its development, owes no part of the benign culture it confers, no one of its glorious fruits, to the moral evil which it contains. Admitting all that can justly be claimed for it on the score of its tendency to illuminate and establish the soul, we contend that precisely in proportion to the prevalence of sin in it, is the system deteriorated. The present has then simply taken the place of a more perfect and beautiful scheme, that would have conducted the race, through processes of trial pursued under better auspices, to happier results. Even as now each earnest and devout co-worker with God, introduces into the system, influences of good which seem never to die out of it, we believe that Adam, had he but stood in his uprightness, might have made it one of unsailing power to develop the soul through scenes of more than Eden’s loveliness, to a piety nobler, and more beautiful, than ever can bless it now. We do not indeed attribute any such results to a single act in its isolation; but we believe that the act in which he fell might have become the turning point of his character, and bound him to holiness as it really did to sin: that his character, once confirmed, might have become then as now, the model of character in his immediate offspring, and through

them have been perpetuated to unknown generations. All this is certainly possible; and though we may not affirm that *precisely* these results would have taken place, it is not to be questioned that some approximation to them would have been actually realized. In the assured conviction that obedience would have brought to him, as to us, strength and blessedness; and that obedience *then*, before the gigantic power of sin had enslaved the world, would have been far more full than now of auspicious and delightful results, we contemplate the introduction of evil with unmixed pain. We think that no act which history records, is to be "deplored" like that which dropped this deadly drug into the very fountain of our being. With no wish, and no willingness, to denounce the errors of one whose candor both ancient and modern sys-

tems seem to have conspired to mislead, we should not do justice to our most deliberate and cherished convictions, did we not declare that, both in judgment, and in feeling, we stand at the widest remove from the views which he has felt at liberty to promulgate.

But our remarks have extended far beyond our design, and we must bring them to a conclusion. We have sought to show, because we sincerely believe, that from investigations pursued in the direction of those which have furnished us our subjects of remark, little good result is to be looked for. It would doubtless be too much to expect that our reasonings should beget any such conviction in Mr. Bellows himself; and we have only to say therefore, that we shall await with interest and examine with respect the farther development which he promises.

## IRELAND: HER SUFFERINGS AND THEIR REMEDY.\*

We approach this subject with pain and diffidence. Our sympathies are strongly excited for the miserable, degraded, starving people of Ireland. Not only are we drawn toward them by the common ties of humanity, but we (the writer) confess also the fellow-feeling of consanguinity with the emerald

isle, though the "white boy" of Tipperary, or the wild boy of Connaught, would hardly acknowledge the remotest kin with a descendant of the covenanting Scotchmen of Derry and Coleraine. Famine, which we have hitherto known only from the page of history, is a present reality. A nation of more than

\* Ireland in 1847: its present state and prospects. By J. Wilson Browne. London: Seeley, Burnside & Seeley, pp. 93.

Thoughts on the Poor-relief Bill for Ireland: together with reflections on her miseries, their causes, and their remedies. By John, Earl of Shrewsbury. London: Chas. Dolman. 1847. pp. 84.

Irish Sufferers, and Anti-Irish Philosophers; their pledges and performances. By Eneas MacDonnell, Esq., Barrister-at-law. London: John Ollivier. pp. 60.

Reply to the Speech of the Archbishop of Dublin, against the Poor-relief (Ireland) Bill. By G. Poulett Scrope, Esq.,

M. P., &c. London: James Ridgway. pp. 41.

Paddiana: or Scraps and Sketches of Irish life, present and past. 2 vols. 12mo. London, 1847.

Ireland's Welcome to the Stranger: or an excursion through Ireland, in 1844 and 1845, for the purpose of personally investigating the condition of the poor. By A. Nicholson. New York: Baker & Scribner. pp. 456.

A Lecture on the antecedent causes of the Irish Famine in 1847, by the Rt. Rev. John Hughes, D. D.

Impressions of Ireland and the Irish. Philadelphia: Zieber & Co. 1845.

eight millions has been deprived of its great staple article of food, and thousands and tens of thousands have perished with hunger, or with the diseases consequent upon extreme privation. We have heard the cry of the famishing; our ears have caught the distant wailing of a once blithe and mirthful land; and we have even encountered in the streets of our own cities, the gaunt, haggard forms of men, women and children who had fled from the jaws of famine at home to die of fever in a foreign alms-house. Our first duty on being informed of this distress, was to relieve it. It was no time to philosophize when men were starving. The citizens of the United States, from Maine to Louisiana, vied with each other in prompt and liberal contributions of food and clothing for the poor of Ireland. It was nothing that those poor are emigrating by thousands to our own shores; it was nothing that New York is called to share with Liverpool the burden of Irish pauperism and crime; it was nothing that those miserable, starving creatures, were of another nation, and under a government which is in part responsible for their condition, and of another and an uncongenial religion, which has its part in the same fearful responsibility; it was enough that they were men, and that they were starving. Ship loads of breadstuffs were sent with the utmost despatch to relieve those whose necessities were most urgent; and every thing was done which sympathy and kindness could suggest to alleviate misery under the embarrassment of distance from the scene of suffering.

A year has elapsed, and the condition of Ireland is but little improved. Notwithstanding the abundant crops of 1847, notwithstanding the uninterrupted flow of charity from England and the United States, notwithstanding that famine, and pestilence, and emigration, have decimated the population in a single

year, there is in Ireland at this moment an amount of destitution and distress which we can hardly estimate. Evicted cottiers, discharged laborers, and a shiftless, ragged, famished peasantry, crowd the streets and highways of town and country, presenting a picture which we can not look upon even at the distance of three thousand miles, but with sadness and horror. Riots and murders have become frequent in some districts, indicating the extremity to which a people naturally docile and patient under suffering, have been reduced, while the commercial embarrassments of England, the insufficiency of all the measures hitherto proposed for the relief of Ireland, the crippling of the energies and resources of the country by forced measures of relief in her extremity, the physical debility which famine has induced, and the general apprehension among medical men of the return of the cholera, cause us to fear that the day of Ireland's calamity has not yet passed.

It is difficult to take a sober review of a subject in which our sympathies are so deeply involved. It is difficult also for us at a distance, to solve the complicated problem of the present condition of Ireland, or to suggest a remedy for its evils which may possibly commend itself to those who are called to legislate upon them, as judicious and practicable. Yet there is no question in which we, as Americans and as philanthropists, can have a deeper interest. In Ireland we may study the workings of civil, social, and ecclesiastical systems, which we in this country have discarded; we may there trace not only in history, but in passing events, the effects of feudal tenures, of a non-resident government, of an established church, and of the Roman Catholic religion. But it is not only as a field of philosophical inquiry, that Ireland invites attention. Her superabundant

population is discharging itself upon our shores to such an extent, that the improvement of the condition of the poor of Ireland is with us a practical question of vital importance. There is no people of Europe in whose welfare we have such a direct personal concern.

The actual condition of the country, in respect to population and resources, must be ascertained, before we can form an intelligent opinion as to the causes and the remedy of its present evils. The population of Ireland is about eight millions, which is, upon an average, two hundred and fifty to every square mile, or one individual for every two and a half acres. The number of families in the kingdom may be computed at one million and a half, two-thirds of which live in what are called third and fourth class houses; i. e. "in mud cabins having only one room, and a better description of cottage, still built of mud, but having from two to four rooms and windows."\* About fourteen million acres are under cultivation, which is but little more than one half the extent of soil under cultivation in England, and yet the proportion of agricultural laborers in Ireland to those in England is as five to two. We have here the phenomenon of a dense rural population—a population more dense than that of England with her vast commercial and manufacturing interests, and with her numerous great towns—upon a territory two-thirds of which is in a very imperfect state of cultivation, and the rest almost entirely unimproved. This density, for reasons which shall be given hereafter, is the result of a recent and rapid increase; the population having more than trebled in sixty years. Agricultural improvements and development of the natural resources of the country not having kept pace with the growth of population, and there

being few manufactures, and comparatively little commerce and trade to employ her surplus, it has come to pass that there are at least "double the number of persons in Ireland that, with its existing means of production, it is able either fully to employ or to maintain in a moderate state of comfort."\*\* Yet this population, by dint of pigs, potatoes, and the poor-house, has maintained not only its existence, but its rate of increase; has supported a burdensome religious establishment, and the more expensive church of its own preference; and has paid its weekly "rent" with exemplary patience, for O'Connell and "repale." But now the potatoes are gone, and with them the pigs, and the poor laws serve only to perpetuate the misery which they can not relieve. Happily, taxes levied at Conciliation Hall have gone with O'Connell himself.

Nothing could so strikingly exhibit the extreme poverty of the people as their dependence upon a single root for subsistence. The loss of one crop, and that by no means the most valuable, has reduced thousands of families to starvation. They have no resources out of their potato pits, and these can yield them no more sustenance than their peat bogs. They have not been accustomed to labor for wages, or to supply their wants through the usual channels of trade. The pig, that universal domestic animal among the Irish, which furnished manure for the little patch of potato-land, and was then sold or killed to pay the rent, lived like his owner upon the product of the soil to which he contributed so much, and now that his "occupation's gone," he has thrown up his perpetual lease, and abandoned his domicil.† What must

\* McCulloch.

† "Your pig has the best part of the cabin." "Faith, and why shouldnt he," quoth Pat, "when he pays the rent."

be the destitution of a country where the very pigs can not subsist! And yet in February of last year, there was found in the county of Sligo, "a hamlet of three cottages, with out-houses, containing three families (of three brothers) numbering in all, thirty-two persons," where adults were, "lying on the ground in fever, unable to move," and children with their little limbs withered to bones and sinews, and their faces and stomachs bloated for want of food, were "*gnawing the flesh from the bones of a pig which had died in an out-house.*"\* So comfortable and contented had these families been, that a few months before they had refused to surrender a lease of twelve acres for £60.

Nor was this an extreme case. Painful as the recital is, we must mention a few others of a similar character, taken at random from the multitude reported upon the highest authority. This part of our subject we would gladly pass over in silence; but it is important that we should realize the extent and aggravation of the misery which we are seeking to alleviate.

Mr. J. Wilson Browne, an English gentleman of intelligence and philanthropy, visited the western districts of Ireland, at the period of greatest distress, in 1847, with a view to ascertain the actual wants and sufferings of the people, and the best mode of administering relief. He confined his observations to the Province of Connaught, "as the part which had been least visited," and particularly to the county of Mayo. Concerning facts which he narrates, he says :

"In making these statements, my object is not to harrow the feelings of my readers by the most horrible cases it was possible to collect. I wish simply to place before them the true state of the

country, as seen by an unprejudiced witness. I neither sought nor inquired for solitary cases of destitution, nor went out of the way to find particular spots worse than others. I simply wish to describe the general state of the country, and for that purpose copy verbatim the notes which were made on the spot. I walked over as much space as was convenient, through a street, along a lane, or by a mountain path, entering promiscuously whatever cabin appeared to contain a few people. Having questioned the latter, I got their answers authenticated by the minister, or some respectable inhabitant of the place, and thus obtained a more general view of the state of the country than isolated cases would afford. I may add that I invariably heard of far worse cases than those I witnessed, from parties constantly on the spot, who furnished me with names, and all particulars; but I forbear speaking of anything that did not come under my own observation. \* \* \* I went prepared to see misery, general and unprecedented, such as had scarcely been equalled in extent or in intensity; but although I did not see one-tenth part of the suffering going on continually around me, I was quite unprepared for what I met. Death seemed to pace the streets—in districts where I had before observed a fine healthy race of people, I encountered collections of skeletons, whose haggard looks spoke volumes of hopeless misery. Wretched countenances—emaciated forms—the dying and the dead—funerals and desolation caught the eye on every side—busy villages were becoming cemeteries—cabins were being turned into charnel houses. I was awe-struck. To appreciate such misery we must behold it."—pp. 8, 9 and 11.

We give a few cases in the simple, graphic language of the narrator, that our readers may be introduced to those scenes of wretchedness with which this unhappy country abounds. The first is from the town of Ballina,—population from 5,000 to 6,000.

"In a small street, called 'Cook's street,' I entered promiscuously a number of cabins, going from door to door and examining the state of each family. The result was, that I found on an average, eight or ten persons congregated together in every hut, without clothing, beyond a few miserable rags to cover them, and without furniture, bedding or food. To describe the condition of the worst, is impossible; but some idea may be formed by comparison when I state, that without the slightest exaggeration, the

\* Correspondence, Board of Works Series, (part 2,) p. 180. Quoted by Shrewsbury.

most comfortably off, had a thin shake-down of straw in a corner, for the whole family to lie upon, with one or two tattered blankets, about the size of a common horse-cloth to cover them. Their cabins were much out of repair, from the inability of the tenants to thatch them, so that the interiors are exposed to every fall of rain which keeps the starving inmates cold as well as hungry. Finally, those who got a living received on the average, 10d. per diem. Indian meal, the cheapest food they could procure, was selling at 2s. 9d. per stone of 14 lbs., and bread was 11d. for 4 lbs., or nearly 2d. per lb. Therefore, each man could procure for his day's wages 33 lbs. of food. A man receiving 10d. a day, has generally a household of eight and frequently ten or more persons to support. Thus each person would get less than half a pound of bread per diem, and this under favourable circumstances. \* \* \* \* \* It is not a matter of surprise, therefore, that I found the inhabitants of Cockle street little more than walking skeletons—their appearance was shocking in the extreme. They seemed as if they could not live through the day, and yet they are most of them still dragging on a miserable existence. Some were standing near the doors, others seated on the ground, round a few sods of half-burning turf, looking melancholy and hopeless—some were stretched on a handful of straw, unable to move from exhaustion, others dying without aid; the children with pallid countenances, some crying to their helpless parents for food, others sunk in unconsciousness of their state, and the majority with swollen eyes and feet denoting the last stage of their disease."

We can not follow the writer in the details of his visits to the cabins separately—the *memoranda* of which, with respect to names, dates and circumstances, are given with a minuteness which inspires confidence—but must leave the horrors which he every where witnessed to be inferred from two or three instances selected at random. In a cabin at Ballina, he found eight persons, a widow, her daughter, her son-in-law, and their five children, subsisting on four quarts of gruel per diem; the man lying on the ground dying of dysentery. This gruel or "soup" as it was called, was nothing but a thin "stirabout" containing one or two ounces of meal to a pint of water. In another cabin he found four

persons,—the head of the family and the two children lying ill, and entirely dependent upon the earnings of the wife on the road, which procured about five ounces of bread for each *per diem*. At Westport, fifteen persons were found in one hovel, who had had but two quarts of meal among them for three days, who were without fire or covering, and several sick and dying. In Castlebar, the principal town in Mayo, he found in a cabin twelve feet by eight, ten persons without employment, four of them adults, subsisting on six quarts of watery soup *per diem*. Three of the children were dying, and there were but two blankets to cover the entire household. In another cabin, the wife was lying dead on a table where she had just breathed her last; the husband was sick and unable to work, with three children of his own and five of another family to be provided for. In the neighborhood of Galway, he found a family of seven persons who had been for a whole day without food, and who were eating a morsel of sea-weed. At Greatman's Bay, a distracted mother buried her children alive, and then attempted to destroy herself. Corpses were deposited coffinless in holes hastily dug, where they frequently became the prey of dogs and eagles. The corpse of a mother was found with the breasts partially eaten off by her own starving infant.

Similar facts are narrated by Father Mathew, by the multitudinous correspondents of the Board of Works, and also by our own countryman, Mr. Elihu Burritt, who was an eye-witness of the horrors of famine. Says the Irish "Apostle of Temperance," in a letter to Mr. Trevelyan, dated Aug. 7, 1848, "On the 29th of last month, I passed from Cork to Dublin, and this doomed plant (the potato) bloomed in all the luxuriance of an abundant harvest. Returning on the 3d inst., I beheld with sorrow one wide waste

of putrefying vegetation. In many places the people were seated on the fences of their decaying gardens, wringing their hands and wailing bitterly the destruction that had left them foodless."

The Dublin University Magazine for April, 1847, gives the following affecting view of the condition of the country.

"Four millions of people, the majority of whom were always upon the verge of utter destitution, have been suddenly deprived of the sole article of their ordinary food. Without any of the ordinary channels of commercial intercourse, by which such a loss could be supplied, the country has had no means of replacing the withdrawal of this perished subsistence, and the consequence has been, that in a country that is called civilized, under the protection of the mightiest monarchy upon earth, and almost within a day's communication of the greatest and richest empire in the world, thousands of our fellow creatures are each day dying of starvation, and the wasted corpses of many left unburied in their miserable hovels, to be devoured by the hungry swine, or to escape this profanation only to diffuse among the living the malaria of pestilence and death. . . . It is an incident of the neglect with which the people, when living, have been treated, that we have no note of them when dead. The occupation of Death has not been interfered with, even by registering the number he has carried off. . . . It is long since the coroners gave over in despair the task of holding inquests upon the bodies of those whom starvation had stricken down. . . . 'Death by starvation' has ceased to be an article of news."

Such was the condition of Ireland in 1847. But it is obvious that misery so general and so appalling could not have resulted from the failure of a single crop, if the people had not been previously reduced to a state

of privation bordering on famine. Mrs. Nicholson's sprightly volume gives us a view of Irish life in the two or three years preceding the famine, when "the distress" was beginning to be felt. The authoress went to Ireland upon a romantic but a philanthropic mission. Having become interested in the Irish as a suffering people, through her charitable intercourse with them in the garrets and cellars of New York, she went at her own expense, "to see the poor peasant by way-side and in bog, in the field and by his peat fire, and to read to him the story of Calvary." She traveled alone and principally on foot, visiting not only the poor of the cities, but the rural population of several counties, and often lodging in their humble cabins and partaking of their humble fare. The latter, however, was no privation to her; for being an ardent disciple of Graham, and having kept a boarding-house in New York upon his dietetical system, what greater luxury could she have asked than the ubiquitous potato served up in true Irish style? We believe that the only instance in which she refused it, was when she had seen the mistress of the cabin wash the delectable 'lumpers' with her feet, and in the pot in which they were to be boiled. She commonly made her way to the hearts of the peasantry by sitting down to their mess of potatoes and salt, even without the accompaniment of "tay and bread;" and luckily for her, the rot had not then become general. Her familiar intercourse with the common people enabled her to gather up many facts touching their condition, which escape the notice of those who furnish us with "Pencilings by the Way" and sketches of "Killarney Lakes"—"from the tops of coaches and from smoking dinner tables." To those who wish to be introduced to Irish life in all its mirthful and its sad realities, we recommend the narrative of this fa-

male "stranger in Ireland," as instructive and truthful, and all the more entertaining because of the occasional eccentricities of the writer. It is worth a dozen "Paddianas." Mrs. N. assures us "that nothing has been added to meet the state of the famine of 1846 and 1847. Facts are related as they occurred and were described in 1844 and 1845; and these facts then indicated that an explosion must soon take place, and that Ireland must be turned inside out; so that all the world might see that, deformed as may be her surface, her vitals show a disease hereditary, obstinate, and still more odious, which opiates or ointments can not cure."\*

But the most graphic picture of the destitution of many parts of Ireland antecedent to the famine, is given in Lord George Hill's "Facts from Gweedore"—a district on the sea-shore of Donegal. A few years since one Patrick McKye, then master of the national school in the parish of Tullaghobegley, barony of Kilmacrennan, county of Donegal, hit upon the happy expedient of taking an inventory of the household effects and farming utensils of the entire parish, containing about nine thousand inhabitants, and presenting it in the form of a memorial to the Lord Lieutenant. This curious document found its way into the newspapers, and is republished in Lord George's interesting pamphlet. The enumeration of sundry articles *not* to be found, is a piece of genuine Irish humor, which relieves the sombre aspect of the catalogue. We give the list verbatim; it rivals that of the "old curiosity shop" itself.

1 cart.	20 shovels.
No wheel car.	32 rakes.
No coach or any other vehicle.	7 table-forks.
1 plough.	93 chairs.
16 harrows.	243 stools.
8 saddles.	10 iron grates.
2 pillows.	No swine (hogs or pigs).
11 bridles.	27 geese.

\* Preface.

3 turkeys.	No parsnips.
2 feather-beds.	No turnips.
8 chaff-beds.	No carrots.
2 stables.	No clover, or any other garden vegetables, but potatoes and cabbages.
6 cow-houses.	Not more than ten square feet of glass in windows in the whole, with the exception of the chapel and priest's house and school house, McDowell's house, and the constabulary barrack.
1 national school.	No bonnet.
No other school.	No clock.
1 priest.	3 watches.
No other resident gentleman!	8 brass candlesticks.
No boots nor spurs.	No looking-glass above 3d. in price.
No fruit-trees.	No fruit-trees.

He stated moreover, that the women were literally shiftless, that more than one-half of the men and women could not afford shoes to their feet; nor could many of them afford a second bed, but whole families of sons and daughters of mature age, would lie indiscriminately together with their parents, and all in a state of nudity.

The land was harrowed with meadow-rakes, and so small were the farms, that from four to ten could be harrowed with one rake in a single day. Man and beast were housed together, some houses having from ten to fifteen tons of dung in them, and being cleaned out only once a year.

In these circumstances, the worthy national schoolmaster of the parish of Tullaghobegley found his school continually decreasing, while he had to support a family of nine persons upon £8 a year.

To what is such abject and universal misery to be attributed? The proximate cause was the failure of the potato crop. But long before this disaster, there was a general and an increasing distress among the peasantry of Ireland, who as we have remarked compose the bulk of her population; there was a condition of property and of society, which rendered the failure of a single esculent, and that among the cheapest and the poorest, a decree of starvation against millions, four-fifths of whose yearly allowance of

food was thus cut off at a stroke. The evil lies much deeper than the potato-rot, or than the famine of which it was the occasional cause. There were antecedent causes in the structure and habits of society, and in the tenure of property, which were fully developed in that unavoidable and fatal calamity. If the interest in the state of Ireland which that calamity has awakened in Parliament and throughout England, shall lead to the removal of some of the prime causes of her degradation, the famine will prove to have been a national blessing.

It is hastily inferred from the general poverty of the Irish peasantry, and from the fact that the potato has formed their principal food, that the soil of Ireland is incapable of sustaining her population. Even Archbishop Whateley seems to incline to this opinion. We have already said that Ireland "with its existing means of production," is incapable of supporting its present population. But the productiveness of the soil is capable of being very much increased, and there are vast natural resources as yet undeveloped. The soil of Ireland, leaving out of view of course the bogs and mountains, which, as at present unimproved, constitute about one-fourth of the whole,—the cultivable soil of Ireland is in general superior to that of England, and equal to that of any part of Europe. It consists chiefly of a "loam, resting on a substratum of limestone," which though commonly shallow, is very fertile, and which in some counties is deep, fine and friable. As a grazing country, Ireland has no superior in Europe. The climate is generally temperate and equable, though excessively humid. This latter circumstance perhaps renders the soil more suitable for grazing than for agricultural purposes, a peculiarity noticed in the most ancient descriptions of the country. Yet it is a curious fact that Ireland exports grain in large

and increasing quantities to Great Britain. In 1800 the quantity of wheat and wheat flour, barley, oats and oatmeal, rye, peas and beans exported, was only 8,296 quarters; in 1818 it was 1,204,738 quarters, and in 1886 it had reached 3,474,802 quarters, or 27,794,416 bushels, of which one-sixth was wheat. This has been about the average since, and even last year the exportation exceeded two millions of quarters. The exports of Ireland, consisting chiefly of corn and flour, butter, pigs, eggs, cattle, &c., have frequently exceeded in value her imports, which are chiefly coal, salt, cotton and woollen manufactures, tea, coffee, tobacco, &c. This certainly does not look like incapacity for domestic prosperity. A country with the balance of trade so often in her favor, and that on account of domestic productions, can not be irretrievably ruined by any calamity, however wide-spread or disastrous. True, this balance may not all return to Ireland in specie; it may be converted to the uses of 'absentee' Irish proprietors, residing on the eastern side of the channel; but the fact itself is instructive.

But we have more specific testimony to the abundant physical resources of Ireland. In the address of the "Royal Agricultural Improvement Society," for 1846, it is stated, that "there is not an estate in Ireland, scarcely a farm, in which, by judicious drainage, the natural powers of the soil may not be brought out, and luxuriant crops reward the labor upon land previously regarded as barren. In every district may be seen tracts in which labor might be expended with advantage; and in all these districts are to be found masses of people in want of food, or of wages to purchase food. It is for the landed proprietors of Ireland to place the wants of the land and the wants of the people in suitable connection; to support the one, by em-

ploying them in connection with the other."<sup>8</sup>

"Mr. Barron, an experienced land agent, stated before Lord Devon's commission, that the county of Waterford alone might be made to produce *five times as much as it does now*. Mr. Blacker and Sir Robert Kane shew that if Ireland were only as well cultivated on the average as the county of Armagh, its produce would be trebled; but *if as well as the best cultivated farms* in the county of Armagh, of an average fertility, it would be multiplied *seven-fold*. The capacity, therefore, of the Irish soil, to repay over and over again, with profit, almost any conceivable amount which could be expended in the employment of the now idle and wasted labor that encumbers it, is incontestable. And in these calculations no account is taken of the waste lands, fisheries, mines, water-power, commercial capabilities, and other as yet almost untouched teeming resources of the island."<sup>9</sup>

The facilities for commerce and for manufactures, furnished by numerous navigable rivers and their tributaries; by a sea-coast many hundred miles in extent, indented with numerous bays and gulfs, affording safe and commodious harbors; by mines of copper, lead, iron and marble, as yet almost un-worked; and by extensive and productive fisheries, hold out inducements for the employment of capital and labor second only to those presented by the sister kingdom. The deficiency of coal is indeed a serious drawback to certain departments of manufacture; but others have been checked by injudicious legislation, and by the unsettled state of the country.

Before the revolution of 1688, the woollen manufacture was carried on extensively in Ireland, but the jealousy of the English manufacturers led to its suppression. "Ireland had

a large woollen manufacture. It reared artisans; it employed agricultural labor; it raised tents; it created capital. These are the resources that England at this day, forgetting the history of the nations, rebukes Ireland for being without, and these are the resources that England by force destroyed. She suppressed that manufacture; the English Parliament declared it an injury to her own, and her creatures. The Irish Parliament, that is, a colony of English Protestants in Ireland, levied a duty on the export, that destroyed the trade."<sup>10</sup> The following fact may explain why it is that poor Pat is so often "without a coat to his back." "It was rumored in England, (A. D., 1698,) that the Irish were making coats for their own backs,—nay, that they had even had the audacity to set up extensive woollen manufactures, to the manifest detriment of those which constituted the staple trade of England. At first the House of Commons ordered a bill to be prepared for quieting these national apprehensions; but, giving up this course, they voted another address to the King. The tone of this address, which will disgust every liberal mind, was like a political anathema and excommunication. According to this document the Irish owed the universal gifts of light and air, life, and soil to tread upon, more to the English Parliament, than to God Almighty. They (the Commons of England) implored his majesty's protection and favor in this matter; and that he would make it his royal care, and enjoin all those he employs in Ireland, to use their utmost diligence to hinder the exportation of wool from Ireland, except to be imported hither, and for the discouraging the woollen manufactures and encouraging the linen manufactures in Ireland: to which the Commons of England should al-

\* Quoted by Scrope.

† Scrope.

\* "Ireland's Claim," by Thom.

ways be ready to give their utmost assistance. To this address his majesty (William III.) made answer, that he should do all that in him lay to promote the trade of England, and to discourage the woolen and encourage the linen manufacture in Ireland."\*

This policy of repressing the productive genius and industry of Ireland by legislation, has been persevered in by the British government with little relaxation to this day. The value of the wool produced in Ireland has been estimated by competent authority at £300,000 per annum. If the domestic woolen manufacture had been left to be regulated by the natural laws of trade, it would have given employment to hundreds now destitute and starving. The linen manufacture, coming less into competition with British labor, has been more favored. The value of the linen annually exported from Ireland is £4,000,000. And yet, says Mr. Browne, "in every part of Connaught I found the signs of past manufactures and commerce. In the cabins were broken spinning wheels, in some of the cottages dilapidated looms: people talked of flax which used to grow, and of kelp and limestone once exported." (p. 75.) Such are the natural resources of a country whose people are beggars. The solution of the miseries of Ireland is not to be found in any want of capacity in the soil to sustain as large a population as any soil upon the surface of the globe.

Shall we then find the solution of this problem in the native character of the Irish; in their indolence and thriftlessness, and proneness to frivolity and vice? So the author of "Paddiana" would have us believe, who describes the Irish as a people "whose besotted ignorance is such that you can not make them under-

stand what is best for them, or that you are trying to benefit them; who have a native cunning and aptitude to defeat your schemes; and who have no sense of independence or shame of beggary."\*\* According to this writer, the Irish are as yet "half savages;" "there is, from high to low, a want of principle amongst them. They spend without thought, and accept without shame: the old spirit of 'coshering' is still strong amongst them, and they are ready to bestow their burdens or their company upon any one who will, under any circumstances, accept the charge."†

But we are not willing to receive our impressions of Irish character from a writer, whose wit is but a small compensation for his obscenity and profaneness; whose associations are with barracks and black-guards; who ransacks the history of a "brave, good-humored, generous, and nose-led people," only to divert himself with the "scrapes into which they have been brought in all ages, by their kings, their chiefs, their priests, and their patriots; and whose most grateful recollection of Ireland,—the incident which he mentions "for the pleasure the recollection gives [him]"—is that at a military ball in one of the midland counties, he "did drink stronger and hotter punch—in greater quantities, and at a faster pace—than it has ever been [his] fortune to do before or since—nay, in any three months of [his] life."‡

Happily we have other authorities upon which to form an estimate of Irish character. The report of the "committee on the state of the poor in Ireland," presented to Parliament in 1823, and drawn up, we believe, by the present Premier, states that "there exists in the mind of the people a great anxiety for labor. The peasantry of the west and south quit

\* Pictorial History of England, vol. iv, p. 82.

\* Vol. ii, p. 131. † Vol. ii, pp. 264, 265.

‡ Vol. i, page 252.

their homes at particular times of the year, in search of employment. Mr. Nisbett, the civil engineer, when examined before the committee of 1819, stated that many hundreds of the peasantry of Kerry had willingly hired themselves as laborers in the neighboring county of Limerick, at four pence a day; and a member of the committee stated that he has known many of them to quit their homes in search of employment, offering to work for the merest subsistence that could be obtained, at the lowest possible rate of wages; for two pence a day, in short, for any thing that would purchase food enough to keep them alive for the ensuing twenty-four hours. When able to obtain labor by contract, or task-work, as it is called, the peasantry are frequently known to over-work themselves in a manner injurious to their health. The inhabitants of those peninsulas of the southwest of Ireland which are washed by the Atlantic, carry the sea-weed and the calcareous sands of the coast many miles inland; and where the mountains are steep, or roads have not been opened, these materials are carried two or three miles inland on the backs of the peasantry. From the above facts, your committee have every reason to conclude, that *so far from being uniformly inactive and idle, the peasantry of Ireland have the greatest desire to procure employment.*"\*

The Irish Railway Commissioners in their second report of 1843, speak of the population of the south of Ireland as "a robust, active race, capable of great exertion, ignorant, but eager for instruction, and readily trained under judicious management to habits of order and industry."†

Testimonials to the same effect might be multiplied from the voluminous correspondence of the

"Board of Works," and from the reports of Parliamentary Commissioners upon the conduct and character of the Irish poor. We select a few at random from the copious quotations of various authors before us. Mr. Dixon, a proprietor of coal pits, near Glasgow, says, "We decidedly prefer the Irish to the Highlanders. They are disposed to learn anything you may put them to."

Mr. Jas. Holmes, a plasterer, at Birmingham, says, "I consider them very valuable laborers. We could not do without them. If treated kindly, they will do anything for you. I would trust them in anything about my house. Before I came to Birmingham I could not bear the thought of employing an Irishman. Now I would sooner have an Irishman than an Englishman for a laborer. An Englishman could not do the work they do. When you push them, they have a willingness to oblige which the English have not. They would die under anything before they would be beat. They would go at hard work till they drop, before another man should excel them. They show as much ingenuity and skill as the same class of English."

To the same effect is the testimony of several of the principal builders of Liverpool. "In general, the Irish are faithful, steady to their work, and almost invariably honest. They are usually very intelligent, and remarkably quick and sharp. Many of them lay up their wages to send to their families and relatives at home."

The Irish yearly resort in great numbers to the sister island, to assist in gathering in the harvest. They are surpassed by no class of laborers in this sort of field work. "I have been assured," says Mr. Browne, "by a gentleman from the south of Scotland, that on his estate he has always found the Irish reapers beat the sturdy Lowland labor-

\* Quoted by Scrope.

† Do.

ers, who are generally considered most able workmen. He added, that in placing the one against the other, he has known the odds to be as four to three in favor of Pat."

We have gone into these particulars because a certain class of writers describe the Irish peasantry as incurably indolent, dishonest, vicious, disorderly, and improvident. The author of *Paddiana*, gravely assures us that "there is not a farmer in Ireland who would blush to withhold his seed-wheat and let his land lie fallow, if he thought there was a probability that the Government would find his seed and till his land for him." Indeed! The shameless, thrifless creatures! Where shall we find farmers or any other class of laborers whose industry would not be relaxed if government should volunteer to support them? "To say that the Irishman will not work, because he has not worked, is a fallacy. Man ever accommodates himself to the circumstances in which he is placed. The native of Ireland was idle because it was unnecessary for him to be industrious. The earth produced for him a root which required little or no cultivation. Upon this, he lived, and by it he paid his little rent, and half clothed his family. Hence, inasmuch as the potato was a cause of his idleness, it was a curse. It has disappeared and his circumstances are now altered: he is no longer a husbandman, for the staple of his husbandry has slipped out of his hand. Death stares him in the face,—he hears the voice, work or die!—the natural instinct of the man is strong in him and he prefers the work to death."<sup>4</sup> Even Archbishop Whately seems to hold the mass of the Irish people in contempt. He gives it as the result of an experience of twelve or fifteen years' residence among them, that they are in general indolent, impro-

ident and worthless. But it appears that laborers under his observation have been employed commonly at a very low rate of wages, and sometimes in useless drudgery, designed as a test, or a mere pretext of employment, such as digging holes and filling them up again, or lowering barnacles hills and raising innocent hollows." In such cases the natural stimulus to exertion is wanting. Men will not work vigorously to accomplish what will be as useless to others as it is unprofitable to themselves. We have rarely seen an Irish beggar in this country who would not go with alacrity to earn a few shillings at the wood pile, but we doubt whether one could be hired to shovel dirt back and forth all day long as a mere test of his willingness to work. The Irish in this country, as a class, are industrious and frugal. They perform our most laborious work. They dig our canals, repair our highways and build our railroads; they bear our burdens, and assist in every description of household labor. If ignorant, they are teachable; if careless, they are capable of improvement; and they will apply themselves cheerfully to anything that promises adequate remuneration. That they are saving, the books of deposit in our Savings Banks will testify; that they have not lost their native generosity, is seen in the fact that during the last year, at least one million of dollars was remitted in small sums by the Irish in this country to their suffering kinsmen in Ireland. The Irish are a mirthful, fun-loving people, easily betrayed into excesses; but they are now as a nation, temperate and moral, and a hardworking race when labor brings profit, or even ensures support. We do not suppose that the Irish peasant will labor as efficiently upon his leased farm of five or ten acres as the New England farmer labors upon his own homestead; nor do we deny that indolence and

\* Browne, page 70.

improvidence are prevailing vices of the Irish poor ; but these are not original and incurable traits of character, they are not the offspring of nature but of circumstances, and the Irish under proper culture, in industry, thrift and enterprise, could soon vie with any people except perhaps this "universal Yankee nation."

We shall now briefly indicate some of the principal causes of the reduced state of Ireland. The superficial observer seizes upon a single fact, such as "absenteeism," "the union of 1800," "the Roman Catholic religion," "the established church," "primogeniture and entail," or "the corn-laws," and makes that account for all the calamities that have befallen an unhappy people for nearly half a century, and of course finds a remedy for their miseries in the immediate and unconditional removal of that one fatal cause. Bishop Hughes specifies three causes of the existing state of Ireland, viz., "incompleteness of conquest," "bad government," and "a defective or vicious system of social economy."\* The second of these was a consequence of the first. The right of supreme dominion over the soil of Ireland having been assumed by the English sovereign without the thorough subjugation of the country by the sword, conflicting interests arose which gave occasion to endless jealousies and collisions between the native and the foreign population. The laws were unsettled and were administered with more regard to power than right; the tenure of property became confused, uncertain and complicated; different and contradictory codes obtained in different sections of the country, and sometimes in the same section among different classes; and every thing was in that chaotic state incident to the want of a supreme government

firmly established and recognized by all.

We have no doubt that British government in Ireland, with all its imperfections and excesses, has been a great benefit to the country ; just as British rule in India, though begun in injustice and perpetuated by abuses, has been of incalculable benefit to the people—an improvement upon the previous social and civil state, and a channel through which the blessings of modern civilization have been conveyed to the east. At the invasion of Ireland by Henry II. in the twelfth century, the country was divided into several petty sovereignties, or semi-independent states, each having its own chieftain, or *tanist* ; and these were perpetually at war among themselves. The people were rude and barbarous, ignorant of the necessary arts of life, unskilled in husbandry, and almost without the rudiments of civilization. By the custom of *tanistry*, land was held only by a life estate, to which the proprietor was admitted by the election of the clan, and from which he might be expelled by a change in the popular will. Property was continually fluctuating, "new partitions of lands were made almost daily," and bloody feuds were engendered among families by the law of inheritance, which gave the estate of the deceased to the most worthy of his name and blood, that is, to whoever of his kin might be best able to hold it against the rest. The most atrocious crimes either went unpunished, or were "compounded for by the payment of an *eric*, or fine ;" the judges or *brehons* were hereditary, and the laws were administered in the open air. The conquest of Henry II. in fact secured to the British crown only about one-third of the island—the southeastern section, which was long known as the English *palat* ; but the sovereignty of the whole island was assumed, and also the right to dispose of its territory. Yet

\* Lecture, p. 5.

the submission of the more powerful Irish chieftains, was only nominal, even within the pale; and as the invaders did nothing to conciliate the native population, but on the contrary enacted laws against their customs and their language, oppressed them in their persons and their property, and treated them as aliens and enemies, there were perpetuated upon the same soil two distinct and hostile races, under conflicting codes and institutions, never intermarrying, and always in a state of virtual war. Here is the first grand cause of the evils of Ireland. England attempted to hold and to govern the country without having actually possessed herself of it, and without merging its native population with her own,—to compel the allegiance of a people by arbitrary measures which served only to keep them in “a chronic state of exasperation.”\* At length after many a bloody struggle on the part of the natives to regain their rights, the supremacy of England was so far established, that toward the close of the fifteenth century it was determined, “that no Parliament should in future be held in Ireland without license from the King; and that no bill or draft of a law should be submitted to its consideration without having been previously sent over to England by the Irish government for the approval, alteration or rejection of the King.” Under James I. some progress was made toward the civilization of Ireland, by the abolition of *erlic* and of *tanistry*; but it was not till the time of Cromwell that the island was thoroughly subdued. The storming of Drogheda and its subsequent fate, terrible as it was, saved the further effusion of blood, and established the English supremacy in every part of Ireland. “The soil was transferred to new proprietors” by the general confiscation of the estates of the rebels, amounting

to about *four-fifths* of the whole. From that time, with the exception of occasional insurrections, the Irish have submitted to the supremacy of Great Britain, which was formally confirmed by the “treaty of Limerick” under William III, after the battle of the Boyne,—a treaty which was soon violated by the victorious party, who trampled upon the rights which they had solemnly covenant-ed to respect, and who made a con-quered people the victims of the most unrelenting political and ecclesiastical proscription. The same revolution which in England result-ed in the enlarged liberty of the great body of the people, in Ireland resulted in “the establishment of the power of the smaller number, at the expense of the civil liberties and properties of the far greater part; and at the expense of the political liberties of the whole. It was, to say the truth, not a revolu-tion, but a conquest—the depriva-tion of some millions of people of all the rights of citizens, and all interest in the constitution, in and to which they were born.”\*

But one more attempt was made to recover the independence of Ireland,—the rebellion of 1798, and that having been suppressed, the Irish Parliament was disbanded, and a legislative union was effected be-tween the two countries. That union has been too much a fiction—the lion entering into partnership with a patient beast of burden for his own advantage. The Irish have still been treated too much as “aliens in blood, language and religion.”

From this hasty sketch of the his-tory of Ireland, it is manifest that one prominent cause, perhaps the main cause of the present prostra-tion of the country, is the manner in which property has been acquired and held. Strangers of another race and of another religion, chiefly

\* Edinburgh Review.

\* Burke, Letter to Sir N. Langrishe, M. P.

non-residents having no local attachment to the country or the people, have come into possession of large estates by acts of confiscation decreed against the original proprietors, for presuming to assert their independence. The new proprietors have not felt sufficient confidence in the stability of possessions resting upon such a basis, or in their personal security among a disaffected population, to expend much time, labor or money on the improvement of their estates. Their policy has been to secure the largest possible income with the least possible expenditure. This has led to the introduction of a class of men between the landlord and the immediate occupiers of the soil, called middlemen, who having leased the estate of the former, underlet it to the latter at such rates as will pay their own rent and yield them the largest profit. The proprietor makes the best bargain with the middleman that he can, and the middleman like the publican of old, extorts the utmost farthing from the sub-tenant. The middleman having no permanent interest in an estate which indeed the proprietor himself can hardly feel to be his own—his object is not the permanent improvement of the property, but the realization of the largest present income which it can be made to yield. Hence estates have been subdivided by under-letting, until according to McCullough, "few of the tillage farms extend to forty acres; the great majority being about five acres, and varying from five to ten and fifteen acres." Now though 'a little farm well-tilled' is to be preferred to a large estate imperfectly cultivated, yet since the tenant of a few acres under an exorbitant rent has no permanent interest in the soil, like that which the ownership in fee simple would impart, there is wanting every stimulus to cultivation and improvement but that of necessity, and the minute

subdivision of the land becomes an enormous evil. "Such a thing as a barn is hardly known among the smaller occupiers: and the corn is not unfrequently thrashed on the public roads, which serve as barn floors." In some parts of Ireland the land is still ploughed and harrowed by attaching the implement to the horse's tail.

The Irishman is emphatically "of the earth, earthy." He covets a bit of land as the greatest of all possessions. Having obtained a lease, he has no further solicitude than to pay his rent. This he has hitherto done by occasional wages and the sale of a pig, while the little patch of grouse for which he pays so dear, has yielded him potatoes for nine months' sustenance. The facility for procuring a crop of oats and of potatoes sufficient for a family and for the limited stock of a small farmer, has encouraged early marriages and stimulated the growth of population. Leased farms of a few acres have been broken up into infinitesimal patches for hopeful sons. Each man 'votes himself a farm,' though it be but a potato-patch, as the first condition of matrimony. "In Ireland, out of the total number of 685,909 farms, nearly one-half are between one and five acres in extent, and nearly five-sixths are between one and fifteen acres. But, great as is the number of small occupiers, the laborers without any land at all, or with nothing but small garden-plots, are far more numerous. Besides, not only can few or none of the occupiers of less than fifteen acres have any occasion to hire laborers, but most of them, after tilling their own fields, have a good deal of spare time, in which they would be very glad to be hired themselves. Of larger farmers, there are only 127,266; and these, with few exceptions, are too poor to hire more assistance than is absolutely necessary to prevent their fields from ly-

ing waste, and too ignorant and spiritless to adopt a better style of culture, if they had the means."\*

This tendency to the minute subdivision of land, has been increased in many instances by the desire of large proprietors to multiply free-holders upon their estates, like the common practice of conveying real estate to constitute a "freeman" under the former statute of Connecticut. But a system, more pernicious still, prevalent in many parts of Ireland, is that known as *con-acre*,— "the letting of small slips of land, varying from a perch to half an acre, for a single season, to be planted with potatoes, or cropped." This land is commonly paid for in labor, and the rent varies from £3 to £10 or £12 an acre, according to circumstances; if manured it can seldom be had for less than £7 per acre. The agricultural laborer earns on an average only 6d. a day, and he is often obliged to abandon his little *con-acre* crop for the rent, which leaves him no alternative but to beg or starve. Of course in these circumstances the failure of a crop is starvation.

In some parts of Ireland, the system of joint-possession or *rundale* exists, not only with respect to land, but also with respect to chattels. Thus in the Gweedore district already referred to, one individual had his share of land in little patches in forty-two different places, without fence, ditch, or other landmark; a half-acre of oats was held by twenty-two persons; a horse had three owners, and went always with one foot unshod for want of a fourth; and sheep had different proprietors for their fore and hind quarters, so that the poor animals might be seen with one extremity bare, (the wool having been cut or pulled off by its owner,) and the other still clothed with a luxuriant natural growth.

\* Thornton on Over-population. Quoted by Shrewsbury.

Such a condition of property produces endless wrangling and litigation. Where land is held in common, the industrious must support the idle and the vicious.

In addition to the evils resulting from these absurd methods of tenure, Ireland is called to contend with the gigantic evil of  *absenteeism*. She is yearly drained of her resources, to support her own nobility and proprietaries upon another soil. The produce of an estate is sent to England to be sold, but the avails instead of being expended in improvements on the estate, making labor for wages abundant, go to sustain the appearance of the proprietor in court life in London. With some noble exceptions, the general policy of the Irish landholder appears to be to get every thing from the land and the tenantry, and to give back nothing. Yet in justice to proprietors it should be said, that estates in Ireland are quite extensively encumbered with jointures, perpetuity leases and entailments of various sorts, and are also heavily mortgaged.\* There were twelve hundred suits of foreclosure in a single term of the Irish courts.

Next to that minute subdivision of land, which has been aptly termed

\* An illustration of the unprofitable condition of landed property in Ireland, is furnished by the following fact.

"The estate of Lord Palmerston in Sligo, was let, about sixty or seventy years ago, in large farms, for three lives, or thirty-one years. In the case of one denomination, comprising a surface of about 1400 acres, where there were six leases, there were found at the expiration of the leases 200 tenants; other denominations were very much more subdivided, giving but an acre and a half to each tenant. Taking the number of occupiers, as far as it can be estimated from Mr. Kincard's evidence, at about 2000, and the rental of the estate at about £4000, allowing one shilling a day as the cost of feeding each occupier and his family, we have £100 per day as the outlay necessary to keep the people alive, or an outlay of the whole rental, £4000, in forty days."—*Letters on the State of Ireland, by the Earl of Rosse.*

"the bane of Ireland," is an evil in part growing out of it, and in part augmenting it—the habit of depending on the potato as the staple article of food. We think it was Cobbett who denounced the potato, when it began to be so extensively cultivated in Ireland, as "the root of all evil," and who predicted its ultimate failure. The Horticultural Society of London has repeatedly protested against the use of the potato as the common food of the peasantry. The potato is easily cultivated, and yields abundantly, but it is a perishable crop, and too bulky for easy transportation. It can not be kept from one season to another, and therefore no provision can be made for the contingency of a failure of the crop. This has been a very frequent occurrence, especially in the provinces of Munster and Connacht, where sometimes for a series of years the failure has been so extensive as to require vast appropriations from government to keep the people from starvation. The humidity of the climate and soil of Ireland is peculiarly unfavorable to this plant; and it is a matter of astonishment, that after such painful experience, and such repeated warnings, the people should have persisted in depending upon a means of subsistence so precarious. The awful events of 1847, will serve to arouse all parties to the necessity of a radical change in this particular. By the general failure of the potato crop, the produce of 2,000,000 acres was cut off, and four-fifths of the food of the peasantry was destroyed. It is computed that between four and six millions of persons in Ireland live solely on potatoes. An acre produces on an average eight tons of potatoes, so that at the average rate of eight pounds a day to each individual, two millions of acres would furnish food for more than twelve millions. The same surface in wheat would not sustain more than one-third the num-

ber. But an able-bodied man is rated at fourteen pounds of potatoes as food for one day, and so uncertain and so perishable is this crop, that the greater proportion of it has been annually consumed upon the soil.

Mr. Thornton, describing the condition of the agricultural laborers says :

"Their food consists of the potato alone, without meal, and in most cases without milk; their cabins are wretched hovels; their beds straw; the wages of labor are reduced to the lowest point, up on an average not more than 6d. a day. Poverty and misery have deprived them of all energy; labor brings no adequate return; and every motive to exertion is destroyed. . . . In the most flourishing counties of Ulster, Armagh, Down and Antrim, where the traveler from the south or west is most struck with the improved appearance of the cottages and their inhabitants, the agricultural laborer in many places can not earn his shilling a day oftener than three days in the week, on an average throughout the year. In winter, from December to March, he has scarcely any thing to do; but at that season, nevertheless, he is often best provided with food, as it is not unusual for him to rent a bit of potato land from a farmer, which he pays for with labor, and the produce of which maintains him in the winter months. His hardest time is in summer, from May or June till August, when he is again out of work, and has besides pretty well exhausted his stock of potatoes; and then, unless he migrates to England or Scotland for the harvest, his only resource is the mendicancy of his wife and children; for he himself can seldom be compelled to beg by the cruellest privations.

In other cases the peasant has a bit of land of about a rood in extent, which he sometimes holds on condition of manuring it: but for which he is much more frequently obliged to pay a most extravagant rent—seldom at a lower rate than £3, and generally, if the land be let to him manured, as high as £7 per acre. From this con-acre, as it is called, he may get nine barrels, each containing forty-two stone of potatoes, on which he may make shift to maintain himself till spring, when employment begins. But in May or June he is again out of work; his potatoes have been long since eaten; and melancholy are the expedients to which he is then reduced. Perhaps he may get some fond on credit from the farmers; and although he has to pay twenty or thirty per cent. for it above the market price, he thinks himself lucky, because he hopes

that his creditors will employ him, in order to ensure payment of his debt. . . . When in the idle season a man is fortunate enough to get a job, it is common for the farmer to give him his wages in the morning, in order that he may buy food for breakfast, and so gain strength to do his work. Men with less powers of endurance than the rent, sometimes eat up their seed potatoes, and with them their only means of subsistence during the ensuing winter; or they grub up young roots in June or July, when they are no bigger than marbles, and as unfit for food from their quality as from their size."

There are always two or three months in the year when potatoes are scarce, and the people must have recourse to other food. Oatmeal has hitherto been the principal substitute; but it is difficult to find a general substitute, for there is nothing poorer or cheaper than potatoes, as a staple article of food. In a wheat country, if a crop fails, though there may be general distress and dearness of food, there will be no starvation; for a people who in common times live upon wheat, can easily obtain something inferior to live upon in a season of scarcity. Thus, in 1800-1, when Great Britain was visited by a famine, so that wheat rose nearly to £6 per quarter, there was great distress among all classes, but there were few cases of starvation even among the poorest. But what help is there for a people who account their "meal year" their misfortune. The Irish peasantry have been in the habit of living almost entirely without money; so that when their potatoes failed, they had nothing wherewith to procure a substitute, however cheap.

Mrs. Nicholson gives us an insight into this feature of Irish life, by such incidents as the following. Meeting a company of laborers repairing the road, she asked, "How much do you get a day?" "Eight pence, ma'am; and its little of the time we get that." "And what do you eat?" "Eat ma'am, we eat potatoes when we can get 'em, and

right glad too we are to have 'em." "And have you no bread?" "Bread! ma'am. Faith! that we don't; if we can get a sup of milk once a day, or a little salt, it's all we look for." "And how can you live on such scanty fare?" "We can't die, please God! and so we must live."

"Please God," they can die now, poor creatures, if that was all they wished.

While the destruction of the potato crop was the immediate occasion of the famine, the fact that her immense rural population has hitherto subsisted on a crop so easily cultivated, and yet so precarious and so perishable, thus living at the lowest point of subsistence and of civilization, and yet increasing in a frightful ratio, this almost universal dependence on the potato must be regarded as a fruitful cause of the miseries of Ireland. For years past, more than fifty per cent. of the whole population have been "living, or rather struggling through a miserable existence, upon the result of a precarious employment, (averaging about twenty-two weeks of the whole year, as given in evidence by the poor-law commissioners,) and the accident of a potato crop, or the alms of those but one degree less afflicted than themselves." The famine has fully exposed this miserable condition of things. It is one of those severe, but wise and kind dispensations of Providence, by which an enormous social evil is made to cure itself. Hereafter the people of Ireland will turn their attention to the cultivation of a staple more reliable than the potato. Indian meal, which was at first known among the peasantry as "Peel's brimstone," and which was administered by the ton as an unpalatable medicament, will gradually become a favorite aliment. The system of property and of society will be reorganized; domestic economy will be improved; comfort, health, and utility will begin to be consulted in

the rude cabin of the peasant; the kitchen, the chamber, and the stable, will no longer be in one; the oven will displace the iron pot, and spoons and forks will supersede nature's utensils. From the lowest point of depression we mark an upward tendency. Time must develop and perfect it.

But we must postpone our reflections upon Irish reform till a future number. We do this with the painful thought, that while every steamer is bringing us fresh tidings of disorder and distress from that unhappy land, our subject can not grow old.

---

### ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES:—AGRICULTURE, MANUFACTURES AND RAILROADS.

THE energy displayed by Great Britain during the latter years of the war with Napoleon, the number of men furnished to recruit her army and navy, and the sums of money raised to support her colonial establishment, were such as to excite the astonishment and admiration of the civilized world. And the attentive reader of history, when he remembers the extent and natural advantages of the island of Great Britain, compared with the resources of the dominions of Buonaparte and his dependent allies, which in the year 1812 embraced almost the whole European continent, when he calls to mind the genius and military power of the French emperor, and when he considers the progress and issue of the contest, will experience similar emotions in a still higher degree. No where does the political economist find presented for his investigation, matter which demands more serious and careful study. Where in the annals of authentic history, is recorded a parallel to the fact, that in the years 1813, 1814 and 1815, Great Britain and Ireland with a population of eighteen millions, raised by loans and taxes five hundred and ten million pounds sterling, or \$2,448,000,000.\*

During the same period the industrial interests of the nation, if we may be permitted to make use of a word whose convenience has within a few years given it currency, were in a state of great activity and prosperity. Indeed this fact alone can explain how such exertions and such expenditures were possible. The commerce of continental Europe having been annihilated, and that of the United States having been fettered by our foolish embargo, the ships of England sailed through every sea without a rival or competitor. Her manufacturers supplied the world with their fabrics, obtaining profits unreduced by the competition of foreigners; for the "continental system" of Napoleon was hardly more successful in excluding them from Germany and Russia, than was the broom of the venerable lady commemorated by Sidney Smith, in keeping the waves of the ocean out of her domicil. The supplies of food required by the government for the army and navy, added to the usual wants of the country, enabled the farmer to obtain high prices for every thing he had to sell. All classes therefore were able to pay taxes, which were imposed, in the memorable language of Sydney Smith, "upon every article which enters into the mouth, or covers the back, or is placed under the foot—upon every thing which it is please-

\* Porter's Parliamentary Tables, quoted in Blackwood's Magazine. The pound sterling is estimated at \$4.80, which is its average value.

set to see, hear, feel, smell or taste—on every thing on earth, and the waters under the earth—on every thing that comes from abroad, or is grown at home—on the ermine which decorates the judge, and the rope which hangs the criminal—on the poor man's salt, and the rich man's spice—on the brass nails of the coffin, and the ribands of the bride."

Since the year 1815, the population of the United Kingdom has increased more than thirty per cent.; but it does not appear that her resources have increased in an equal proportion. To an attentive observer, it has been evident for some years that the great interests of the country were less healthy than heretofore, and that many things which to a superficial eye seemed like vigorous growth, were in truth the result of diseased action. To most men this statement would have seemed, a year since, almost paradoxical; at the present time no one, we believe, would hesitate to admit its truth.

In our last number we suggested to our readers some thoughts respecting the causes of the financial crisis of England. That article being limited both by time and space, was less thorough and minute in the examination than we wished. We propose at the present time to consider somewhat in detail, the situation of Great Britain in several respects, and particularly in respect to the great interests of agriculture, of manufactures, and—what has recently begun to rival these in importance—of railways; and to compare her situation and prospects as to these particulars, with those of our own country.

The national debt of Great Britain is too important an element of her political organization, and exerts too great influence upon her prosperity, not to demand careful examination in an enquiry of this nature. Were it due wholly to her own citizens, it might be regarded as neither

increasing nor diminishing the national wealth; since if it were annihilated by a simple act of repudiation, the amount of tangible actual property in the country would be precisely the same as at present. But this view would be exceedingly imperfect and superficial. The debt amounts to eight hundred million pounds sterling, and the annual interest is more than half the national income. It is impossible to say how many persons receive from this source a sufficient revenue to maintain their families without their own exertions; but it is not improbable that there are nearly half a million; and these with the landed aristocracy, the pensioners of government, the army and navy, and a multitude of smaller divisions, constitute the class of *non-producers*;—of those who contribute nothing by their industry to the national wealth, and who are supported by the labor of others. This class exists in every country, but with us it is so small as hardly to produce any perceptible effect upon our social organization; in Great Britain it is very numerous and powerful, controlling the legislation of the country, and affecting every department of its industry. To support this class in idleness and luxury, all other members of the community are taxed to the extreme limit of endurance. In a time of general prosperity their numbers and influence attract comparatively little attention; but now, when the pressure of every burden seems augmented tenfold, the most ignorant and unreflecting laborer can hardly fail to realize that were there not so many who eat but do not work, his own labor would secure for him a more adequate support; and the political economist will not hesitate to say, that the national debt of England is among the most efficient of the causes which have embarrassed the industry and impaired the prosperity of the people.

It is stated in a recent number of *Blackwood's Magazine*, that the yearly value of the real or heritable property in England and Scotland, ascertained by official documents, is ninety million pounds sterling, or four hundred and thirty-two million dollars; and this at twenty-five years purchase, which we believe to be the usual estimate, gives the absolute value, £2,250,000,000, or \$10,800,000,000. This vast amount, so far as it consists of land for cultivation, is almost without exception leased by the owner to the cultivator; the exceptions, where the occupant is the owner of the land, being hardly more numerous, or more important in a general estimate, than are cases of an opposite character in our own country.

We can not, perhaps, better present our views respecting the condition and prospects of the agricultural interests of Great Britain, than by contrasting them with those of the youngest member in our confederacy of states—Wisconsin. The island of Great Britain contains about eighty-five thousand square miles, or almost fifty-five million acres: Wisconsin is four-fifths as large. The soil of Wisconsin is naturally more fertile, and a larger portion of it, beyond doubt, is more susceptible of cultivation, than in England and Scotland. These are the only particulars in which these countries can be compared: in every other we shall contrast them. There are in England and Wales more than three hundred inhabitants to the square mile; in Scotland, about ninety; in Wisconsin, three. In the former countries every acre which promises a tolerable reward to industry, is cultivated with a degree of skill and care of which few of us form a conception; in the latter, the traveler often passes ten or twenty miles, through prairies of unsurpassed fertility, without meeting an inhabitant, while the imperfect and careless manner in

which the land is tilled, would excite extreme astonishment in an English farmer. In England, the average value of an acre of land may, we are informed, be roughly estimated at fifty pounds, or nearly two hundred and fifty dollars; in Wisconsin, our President will sell for the same price two hundred acres.

From this comparison we infer, and we believe that our readers will allow that the inference is not unwarranted, that unless the policy of the British government with respect to the admission of bread stuffs from foreign countries should be modified, the value of their land is destined to a steady and permanent decline. Previous to the recent change in the English corn laws, the "sliding scale" prevented the importation of wheat from abroad, except in times of scarcity and extreme high prices, and the price in the London market was rarely so low as a dollar and a half, and usually exceeded two dollars a bushel. The farmer in Wisconsin will be highly prosperous if he can sell his wheat at sixty cents a bushel, which is about equal to two dollars and fifty cents for a barrel of flour, and at times it can be transported from Milwaukee to Liverpool for an equal amount. The British duty, after March 5, 1849, is, we believe, to be less than twelve cents a barrel for flour. How can the English farmer buy or hire land valued at two or three hundred dollars an acre, pay the taxes, tithes and poor rates, which press so heavily upon the national industry, and compete successfully with his American rival. Nor can he cherish the hope that in equalization of prices, the value of land in Wisconsin will rise so as to meet him half way. Should this take place, he must sustain the competition of Nebraska, Minnesota, and other districts stretching into the far west, which will in a few years become populous states.

We have in our own country an illustration of the manner in which the causes we have suggested operate. Soon after the completion of the Erie Canal, lands in Western New York began to increase in price, and rose steadily in value until they were sold in many cases at from sixty to one hundred dollars an acre. But as soon as Ohio and Michigan began to produce wheat in quantities greatly exceeding their own consumption, and were able to deliver in Buffalo several millions of bushels annually, the value of these lands began to decline. A year or two since we were informed that the depreciation was so great, that lands which some years before had been mortgaged for two-thirds or three-fourths of their value, would not at that time sell for the amount of the mortgage. The same thing is strikingly evinced by the fact, that the aggregate population of twenty-four counties in the State of New York, comprising some of the most fertile in the central and western parts of the state, was less in 1845 than in 1840.

Though it may appear to our readers a new and unwarranted view of the subject, it seems to us not impossible that an approximation may take place in the value of labor in the two countries, which would tend to the same result. It is universally known that in England there has for many years been so great a surplus of labor, that its wages barely sufficed to support life. In this country, and particularly in the new states, wages have, from the opposite reason, been high; so high, that few of us can realize, what is nevertheless true, that there has been more than one instance within the last quarter of a century, when in the vicinity of New York, able-bodied men, in large numbers, have applied for work, asking no compensation except their food. If the emigration from Europe to this country should increase in the same

ratio as for three years past, we shall during the next ten years receive in this manner an average accession to our population of more than half a million annually, most of whom will be young and middle-aged. Whether so many of these will come from Great Britain as in time to increase the rate of wages by diminishing the comparative number of laborers, and whether so large an accession to our population will not lessen the prices of labor by occasioning an over supply, it is not safe to predict, but it certainly is by no means impossible.

We do not wish to be understood as expressing an opinion that the change in the policy of Great Britain respecting her corn laws, was unwise. On that point we shall not enter, as we have neither time nor space for even a hasty examination of the subject. We shall only quote the view suggested to us by a very intelligent Englishman, when we stated to him some of the evils that might result from her present course. He told us that the English government were obliged to sacrifice in part the interests either of the farmer or of the manufacturer, and decided to protect the latter rather than the former.

From the agriculture we will turn our attention to the manufacturers of Great Britain. Previous to the peace which terminated the long and desolating wars with Napoleon, Great Britain was almost the only manufacturing nation in the civilized world. Our own manufactures were in their infancy, hardly extending beyond the coarsest fabrics, and the most common implements of agriculture. France and Germany produced some articles of prime necessity for the supply of their own wants, but with little skill and success; and notwithstanding the continental system of Napoleon, the wants of those countries were principally supplied by British artisans. Immediately after

the close of the war, immense quantities of English goods were sold to the different nations of the continent, while the British corn laws prevented the agricultural products of these countries from being received in payment. The consequent drain upon their resources was such, that the governments of France and Germany soon perceived that, unless some remedy were applied, their subjects would be reduced to ruin. They, therefore, by the imposition of heavy duties, discouraged the importation of many kinds of foreign goods, and thus promoted their manufacture at home. And as manufactoryes of cotton and woollen goods, and hardware, were established, and flourished, the rate of duty on foreign goods was increased, and the importation of many descriptions virtually prohibited.

In our own country the same result has been attained. The tariff of 1816 can be hardly said to have been framed for the protection of American manufactures, for these were then so insignificant in extent that they were scarcely deemed worthy of protection by our government. It is true that they had excited the jealousy of our English rivals, as is evident from a celebrated speech of Lord Brougham, and that some of our statesmen, among whom Henry Clay was preëminent, had even before this period deemed the establishment of a large manufacturing interest essential to the full development of the resources of the country. But the attention of our citizens, and especially of those of New England, being directed to manufactures by the tariff of 1816, the success of their efforts led to the imposition of higher duties in 1824 and 1828: and though the policy of our country has since been fluctuating, our manufacturers have acquired such skill and capital, that in many branches they are independent of tariffs and the protection of government. To illus-

trate the rapidity and extent of the change, we would mention that fifteen years since about nine-tenths of the hardware goods sold in this country were imported, while we believe that at the present time about two-thirds are made at home.

Owing to the gradual growth of the manufacturing interests of the continent and the United States, Great Britain has been deprived of the most wealthy and valuable customers for some of her productions, and has experienced so severe competition with respect to others, that her profits have been very seriously reduced. Nor has the evil stopped here. The German and American manufacturer has not only supplied his fellow-citizens with the goods which they had been accustomed to import from England, but he has extended his operations, and carried his hardware and coarse cottons to Brazil, to the Levant, and to China. It is owing to this cause, in connection with some others, that the amount of cotton goods sent from England to the East Indies has so seriously diminished within the last three years.

There are so many causes that affect differently the various branches of the manufacturing interest of Great Britain, and modify their prosperity, that we can not present at a single view a correct description of their present condition. The manufacture of pig and bar iron has been for several years past extremely profitable, owing to the immense demand for the construction of railroads; but at the present time, in consequence of many of those roads being suspended, the price has fallen below the cost of production. It was recently stated in the House of Commons, by Lord George Bentinck, that "cotton manufactured goods were exported cheaper than the raw material from which they were formed could be imported into the country." Those who are acquainted with the prices at which

such goods have recently been sold in this country, will readily believe that the assertion is correct. It is very evident that manufacturers have experienced their full share of the disasters which have recently affected all classes in Great Britain. Many of them have become insolvent, and a much larger number have probably been brought to the verge of ruin. It is generally understood that the manufacturing establishments in this country have for the last five years been in a situation of great prosperity, and that the accumulation of wealth, resulting principally from this cause, has been larger than in any previous period in our national history. At the present time, owing to foreign competition, to the embarrassment of our national finances, resulting from the Mexican war, and to the consequent stagnation of business, several branches of industry are embarrassed, and all are depressed; we can not but hope that the depression will be temporary, and that the causes which have produced it will in a short time cease to operate.

With respect to the future, we think that some of the causes which have depressed the manufacturers of Great Britain must continue for a long time to produce similar results. In competing with the manufacturers of Germany, they encounter labor at even lower prices than their own, with skill and command of machinery which have for many years been steadily increasing, and with abundant capital at low prices. Nor is there any prospect that the governments of Europe or this country will cease to impose so high duties as very seriously to discourage the importation of foreign goods. And we think that the manufacturers of the United States will find in the superior intelligence and energy of the operatives, in their ingenuity and skill in the invention of machinery, in

their abundant and cheap water power, united to their large and rapidly increasing home market, sufficient advantages to counterbalance the difference in the price of labor, and to enable them to compete successfully with their English rivals.

The employment of associated capital in large amounts, and under such regulations that it is not exposed to many of the contingencies and embarrassments which attend individual enterprise, is, so far as we are aware, peculiar to this country, and at the present time is almost exclusively confined to New England. The manufactures of Lowell, employing nearly twelve millions of capital, are conducted in this manner, and are a favorable illustration of its advantages. It would be foreign from our purpose to discuss the merits of this system. It is sufficient to remark, that not being disturbed by the death or withdrawal of a partner, and usually commencing with funds more adequate to the business than can be furnished by individuals, such companies have commonly proved permanent and successful.

The manufacturing systems of the two nations should be compared, not only with regard to their effects upon the national wealth, but likewise upon the intellectual and moral character of the operatives. This comparison is one which can not fail to awaken in an intelligent American, feelings of the highest satisfaction. The concurrent testimony of all writers on the subject, assures us, that the great mass of English operatives are profoundly ignorant, not only of the elements of education, and the first principles of religion, but of almost every thing else not immediately connected with their individual employments. Entering the manufactory at a very early age, and spending their whole lives in an employment which is varied only to suit their strength

and size, exhausted by working in a confined and unhealthy atmosphere to a degree often beyond their strength, with wages insufficient to procure sufficient food and comfortable clothes and dwellings, how can it be expected that the operatives of Manchester and Leeds should have the opportunity or wish to acquire knowledge. As to their moral character, we will mention a fact communicated to us by a highly respectable and intelligent manufacturer of Sheffield. He stated that the house with which he was connected employed five hundred workmen; that two hundred and fifty could do as much work as they required, if they worked steadily; but that so much time was lost in consequence of prevailing habits of intemperance, that they were obliged to retain the number we have mentioned in their employ. That a very large proportion of the females employed in the cotton mills of Manchester are licentious, is universally reported. Of course these remarks apply more to some branches of manufactures than to others, and are true in the highest degree where the population is most concentrated. We refer any of our readers who wish a more extended view of this subject, and who are willing to read details of oppression and suffering, to "Helen Fleetwood," by the late Charlotte Elizabeth; in which work that distinguished writer gives a vivid account of life in a manufacturing town; also to the Rev. John Mitchell's "Notes from Over Sea."<sup>\*\*</sup>

The precarious tenure of employ-

ment has a disastrous effect at times upon the character and condition of the operatives. It was recently stated by the police of Manchester, that of the whole number in that city about one-fourth were wholly unemployed, one-fourth were working short time, and less than half were employed full time. As full employment will earn a meagre and insufficient subsistence, it is evident that a large proportion of the workmen in that town were partially or wholly dependent on the poor fund for support, and were greatly exposed to suffering and to crime. The system of "trades unions," and "strikes," to which we shall barely allude, exerts a most unfavorable influence upon the operatives, and is at times highly injurious to the national prosperity. Nor are the arbitrary restrictions to which many of them are subjected, such as requiring seven years apprenticeship before they are allowed to work at a particular trade, the prohibition of removing from one place to another except on certain conditions, and many others which might be mentioned, less pernicious.

As most of our readers are acquainted with our own manufacturing establishments, it is not necessary to compare them in detail with their English rivals, as to the particulars we have enumerated. In almost every respect there is a complete contrast. Our workmen are, as a body, well paid, well fed, industrious, healthy, and prosperous; and are of course respectable and valuable members of the community. With respect to intelligence, morality and religion, our manufacturing towns will compare favorably with the average of our population. To illustrate this by a single example, we would mention, that in Lowell no female is allowed to work in the manufactories who does not sustain a good moral character, that those employed in that town have in the aggregate about a million dol-

\* That a very large proportion of the laboring classes are ignorant, immoral, and debased, with their physical wants very imperfectly supplied, and their claims as moral and religious beings almost wholly neglected, is so abundantly obvious, that we hardly need refer to Parliamentary reports or to books of travels, for every British review and magazine asserts the fact in the most unqualified manner, and each of them proposes a different remedy.

lars in the savings bank, that a larger proportion of them are members of Christian churches than probably of the whole population of Massachusetts, and that most of them, after remaining there long enough to earn a 'fitting out' for themselves, or to assist in supporting their parents, or educating their brothers, return home and become the wives of farmers. We do not hesitate to express the conviction that the manufacturing system of New England, and indeed of the whole Union, has been of decided benefit, not only in augmenting greatly the national wealth, but in elevating the tone of morals and religion.

If our readers regard the views we have expressed as founded on truth, they will concur with us in the opinion that the radical defect in the social system of England is the depressed and degraded condition of the laboring classes of the community. In refinement of manners, in the cultivation of the intellect, in all the amenities which render home dear, and diffuse a charm over social intercourse, the middle and upper ranks of Great Britain are certainly unsurpassed by any nation of Christendom; but the line which separates these classes from the agricultural and manufacturing operatives, is deep and wide.

It has long appeared to us that the legislators of Great Britain fail to recognize the obligation resting on them to adopt such measures as would lead to the intellectual and moral elevation of the poor; and that unless an entire change takes place in this respect, the days of her preëminent power and greatness are numbered. It is foreign from our present purpose to state in detail what measures we think they ought to adopt. That the church establishment should be so modified that dissenters should not be required to contribute to its support, and that a large part of its wealth should

be applied to the service of the state; that the system of taxation should be changed, so that the wealthier classes, and especially the nobility, should contribute far more to the support of government than they now do; that the game laws should be abolished; that official salaries and pensions should be very much reduced; that many old and venerable abuses and monopolies should be done away; are points concerning which we can not entertain a doubt.

We have already intimated that we regard with distrust the recent changes in the commercial policy of England, and still more those which appear to be contemplated. It is always unsafe to make radical and important changes in the policy of a nation, in times of general embarrassment and distress. Relief is so much wanted, that sufficient regard will not be given to the ultimate results of the measures by which it is sought. The producers of food, the colonies, and the shipping interest, have long been protected against the competition of foreigners. From two of these interests this protection has been suddenly and almost entirely withdrawn; and the most recent intelligence gives us reason to believe that the ship owner will soon experience the same fate. We have already stated what we believe will be the result of the competition between the English farmer and his foreign rivals. From the East and West Indies we receive the most gloomy accounts of commercial embarrassment and depressed prices, and forebodings of continued and augmented evils. Our neighbors on our northern frontier, having their timber depreciated in value by the rivalry of the Baltic, and their provisions undersold by ourselves, are beginning to "calculate the value of the union," and to inquire whether they would not be more prosperous and happy, if separated from the mother country, and left to their own

unassisted but unfettered energies. And if the navigation laws of England, that memorial of the statesmanship of Oliver Cromwell, are repealed, and the ships of Norway, of Hamburg, and of the United States, are admitted to free competition with her own, we shall not be surprised to find that ere long the wooden walls of old England will begin to show signs of decay. And unless changes take place in the relative condition of Great Britain and our own land, which can not be now anticipated, we think it probable that while we increase in wealth and power with a rapidity hardly ever equaled in the history of nations, our mother country, if she does not like the house of Saul wax weaker and weaker, will at least remain stationary.

If we examine the railroads of England and compare them with our own, we shall arrive at results very similar to those which we have ascertained respecting the agriculture of the two nations. In this as in the former case, every thing in Great Britain is done in a manner very thorough and very expensive, in a manner appropriate to the situation of a nation of abundant resources and circumscribed territory. In our own country on the other hand, railroads are built at comparatively moderate cost, the engineer being commonly more desirous of accomplishing the work at the minimum expense, than of attaining the maximum power and speed, remembering that our wealth is limited, while almost 'the whole boundless continent is ours.'

The first railroad in Great Britain was opened for the use of the public, only about twenty years ago, but they have been regarded with so much favor by the community, that last year there were in operation three thousand five hundred miles of railways, which had been constructed and equipped at an expense of five hundred and thirty million

dollars. And during the year 1842, notwithstanding the unparalleled financial embarrassments, the 'calls' for money to pay for roads in the process of construction amounted to about one hundred and ninety million dollars, in addition to more than thirty millions, furnished by British capital and expended in foreign countries. It will be seen from the above statement that the railroads already completed in Great Britain, have cost on an average more than a hundred and fifty thousand dollars a mile. This immense amount has been expended in preliminary outlays, which in some cases, in consequence of the difficulty of procuring charters, owing to the vicious system of legislation, have amounted to half a million dollars;—in the purchase of the necessary lands at enormous prices;—in preparing the road bed, which is made with grades and curves more favorable, and of course more expensive, than are required in this country;—in laying the superstructure, which is in all cases a double track, of very heavy iron, and laid in the most thorough and permanent manner; in locomotives and cars for the equipment of the road; and in incidental expenses, an item covering salaries and interest, together with many other things of which we have little knowledge from our own experience.

To give a similar view of the railroads in the United States, we would remark that there are now in operation more than five thousand miles of railways, and that these have cost about a hundred and fifty million dollars, or about thirty thousand dollars per mile. A large majority of those built previous to 1846, were built with flat rail and very imperfectly constructed; but we are not aware that any road is now in the process of construction which has not a heavy rail, and is not built with suitable regard to safety and durability, while on many of the old roads the light rail has been or

will soon be replaced with heavy iron.

With respect to the productiveness of railroads in the two countries, it is exceedingly difficult to present adequate and satisfactory statements. Many of the companies in this country have expended their income in payment of debts or in extending and improving their roads, and there are many in distant parts of the Union, respecting which it is difficult to procure the necessary information. There are in this country and probably in Great Britain many roads constructed several years since, which in consequence of the business being imperfectly understood, of bad management, of the high prices of materials and labor, or of other causes, have cost far more than would now be required to build them or than they are worth. The Housatonic railroad for instance, and the road from New Haven to Hartford, could now be built for one half the sum they have actually cost. We doubt whether there are two roads in New England which have not during the last year earned seven per cent. on what it would now cost to build them; and we believe that their aggregate income would give a dividend of ten per cent. on their cost if estimated in the same manner. The roads in Massachusetts have during the year 1847, earned in the aggregate, a sum equal to eight per cent. on their cost. Of the roads out of New England a few have been very productive; some of them, the Michigan Central road being one, have been probably more so than any of the New England roads. Many of the roads at the south and west, for some of the reasons which we have stated above, have yielded no income to their owners. It is stated that the aggregate income of the roads in Great Britain, during the past year, was a little over four per cent. upon their cost. It should, however, be remembered that the year 1847 was

in this country a period of extraordinary prosperity, but in Great Britain, of unusual disaster, and that from this cause our roads have been more prosperous and theirs less so than usual.

If the views we have expressed respecting the prospects of the manufacturing and agricultural interests of the two nations are correct, it will be readily inferred that money invested in American railroads, will yield larger returns than will be received from British investments. Their railroads are built at very great expense, through an extremely populous and highly cultivated country, abounding with manufacturing establishments; while many of ours pass through regions in which hardly one-tenth the resources for manufactures and agriculture are developed. Especially is this the case with some of the roads in the southern and western states. Of course, railroads will share in the prosperity of the countries through which they pass. Nor do we entertain a doubt, that the railroad mania which has prevailed in England for some time has led to the construction of many works which will be almost entirely unproductive, and that the amount expended upon them will have been so great as very seriously to diminish the average income of the whole system. And we are fully convinced that railroads judiciously constructed and well built, will be increasingly valuable, and that investments in them will be, on the whole, safer than in most other descriptions of property, as they are less liable to suffer from the frauds of officers than banking institutions, and less exposed to the fluctuations of business than manufactures or agriculture.

It is evident that every railroad judiciously located is beneficial to the community, provided two conditions are observed; that it shall not cost more than it is worth, and that it shall not withdraw money

from the ordinary pursuits of business which can not be spared without injury. But very many railroads have been built, both in this country and in Great Britain, in which one or both of those conditions have been violated. Disregard of the latter is universally regarded as one of the principal causes of the financial convulsions in England; and our own expenditures, though comparatively very small, have combined with other causes in producing much embarrassment in the commercial business of this country. We hope that this embarrassment may have a favorable effect in checking what is in danger of becoming among ourselves a railway mania, to illustrate and prove which danger we will state only two facts; that railroads are now being built in the state of Vermont, which will cost about ten millions dollars, and that more than sixty applications for railroad charters have been made to the legislature of Massachusetts at its present session. We ought, also, to remember that in Great Britain, no money is sent out of the country when a railroad is built, that the material and labor are wholly British, while in our own case, we often purchase English iron with American gold.

But we shall take a very superficial view of the comparative benefits of railways to the two countries, if we do not consider the relative size, and previous advantages of the two nations. In England, owing to the excellent public roads, and to canals, every part of the country was accessible at a moderate expense of time and money. The railway was therefore a convenience, not an article of prime necessity. In our own land, notwithstanding our rivers, canals and lakes, there are vast regions from which the expense of transporting produce to market greatly exceeds the cost of producing it, and where the traveler during a considerable part of

the year must plod at the rate of two to four miles an hour.\* We will refer, to show some of the benefits of railroads to a thinly settled country, to the Michigan Central road. This road is about two hundred miles long, extending from Detroit directly across the state. Before it was built, it was necessary for the farmer residing fifty or a hundred miles from that city, to carry his wheat or flour by wagons over very bad roads; and as the soil of the central parts of the state, though productive, was not exuberantly fertile like a great part of Illinois and Wisconsin, the tide of emigration seemed likely to be diverted from the state. By building the road, a belt of land a hundred and sixty miles long and forty broad, is brought within twenty miles of a market, and we do not consider it an extravagant estimate, to assume that this tract, embracing more than four million acres of land, will within ten years be worth on an average, two dollars an acre more than if the road had not been constructed. Similar calculations might be presented, respecting roads which are chartered or proposed, and which will traverse the immense prairies of the northwestern states or the cotton fields of the south. Whether the project for a road to the Pacific should be regarded as an object of serious consideration for the present generation, we will not say: we would remark, however, that it might have been built for a smaller amount than the Mexican war has cost.

Regarding England as the home of Cromwell, and Shakspeare, and Milton, as the birth-place of our pilgrim fathers, as the bulwark for many generations of our holy Protestant religion, as the pioneer in the great work of subduing this re-

\* In October last, the writer of this article, passed fifteen hours in going forty miles in the mail stage, on the most important public road in Illinois.

volted world to the obedience of Christ; we can not but contemplate her future prospects with deep and anxious interest. We earnestly desire that she may adopt such meas-

ures that her ignorant and degraded population may be enlightened, that her poor may be fed, and that the light of the gospel may shine forth, enlightening all her dwellings.

### PEACE—AND WHAT NEXT?

So we are to have peace with Mexico. The form of a treaty has been agreed to by the President and Senate; and it only remains for our General-in-chief and our diplomatic commissioners to find at Queretaro, or elsewhere—or to set up if they can not find—some shadow or pretense of a government from which that treaty, as we call it, shall receive some sort of ratification. Then the war which is said to have been begun “by the act of Mexico,” will be declared to be ended, “by the act of Mexico.”

This whole matter of making a treaty, is little else than a sham. All men know—the President and Senate not excepted—that there is not in Mexico any government that is competent to make a treaty in behalf of the Mexican people; much less is there in that unhappy country, any government which is competent to keep a treaty. How is it then, that we are to have peace? Setting aside the formalities of negotiation and ratification, those thin pretenses under which the arrangement is set forth, and looking simply at the arrangement itself as an arrangement having all its validity from the will of our government, what is it? Simply the arrangement which was recommended eighteen months ago by Mr. Calhoun, by Gen. Taylor, by Com. Perry, and indeed by every man who looked at the case with even half an eye. We announce our determination to keep a certain portion of the Mexican territory which we have conquered and which is as

conveniently contiguous to our own as Naboth's vineyard was to Ahab's palace grounds. We draw a line upon the map, marking with “red ink” from ocean to ocean; and assuming that line for our frontier, we undertake to defend it. Beyond the line which we have drawn, there may be pronunciamentos, revolutions, dictatorships; and we give ourselves no concern. But this side of the line, we hold the sovereignty, and we will keep it. Along that line we will maintain whatever military force shall be necessary to keep invasion at a distance. One faction after another—ascendant for the hour at the city of the Aztecs, may swagger about the honor of “the magnanimous Mexican nation,” and may swear to restore the integrity of the republic. But along the line which we have made our boundary, our forts and stations, commanding all the passes, and garrisoned with a standing force of twenty thousand men, shall keep the territory we have conquered, so that no Mexican shall dare to show himself in arms, till it shall be occupied with a population of our own citizens able to keep it for themselves. Nobody supposes that the paper called a treaty, whatever pretended ratification it may receive at Queretaro or elsewhere, can give us any right to those provinces which we had not before, or can enable us to hold those provinces with one soldier less or one gun less than if the farce of negotiation and ratification had never been enacted. We get peace not by a compact with any actual Mex-

less government, not by a compact to which the Mexican people are in any sense a party, or which they will regard as of any binding force, but only by ceasing from the active prosecution of the war, while we content ourselves with holding by mere strength just as much of the Mexican territory as we choose to keep.

And what have we got? Peace, such as it is. Peace, guarded with a standing army of twenty thousand men, and a line of military stations stretched across the continent. And what else? We were to have "indemnity for the past and security for the future," and nothing less—"the whole or none." "Indemnity for the past," as the past was at the commencement of the war, was estimated to be some five millions of dollars due from the Mexican government to citizens of the United States. "Security for the future," was security against any depredations on our citizens hereafter by Mexican functionaries,—security in other words, that in all time to come there shall be in Mexico a government not only able and willing to pay its just debts, but able and willing to restrain its functionaries from all injustice towards our citizens. This is what we were to get. Have we got it? We have expended a hundred millions of treasure,—perhaps it will turn out to be a hundred and fifty millions when the accounts are all settled. We have lost some twenty thousand lives. We give up all our claims against Mexico in behalf of our citizens, and become bound to pay those claims ourselves. And what do we get? We have conquered for Texas a boundary which she could never have conquered for herself, and which she never claimed but in the merest gasconade. We have gained not for the Union, but for that one state, an area of three hundred and twenty-four thousand square miles. We have made that state of Texas more

than seven times as large as the "empire state" of New York. All the public lands this side of "the Rio Grande, from its mouth to its source and thence due north to the 42° north latitude," are the public lands, not of the United States, but only of the state of Texas. What else have we gained? "We, the people of the United States,"—what have we gained for ourselves by this lavish expenditure of treasure and of blood? We have gained Upper California and that part of New Mexico which lies beyond the Rio Grande. Is this our indemnity for the past? No, we pay for it, not only the hundred or hundred and fifty millions which the war has cost us, but fifteen millions more. For Upper California and half of New Mexico, with their wild mountain ranges and their vast deserts, which is all that we get, we give—besides renouncing our claim for five millions of indemnity—no less a price in money than we gave for Louisiana including the Mississippi and all that lies beyond it. No man will pretend that we give Mexico a dime less than all the real value of whatever we retain beyond the Rio Grande. Where then is that "indemnity," for which the war was to be prolonged indefinitely? And where is our "security for the future?" Will any man tell us that the treaty, so called, affords us any security? What guarantee have we that henceforward there shall be in Mexico a government more honest or more capable than the government which they have had heretofore? All our security against Mexican aggression lies in our power to defend the line which we have taken—a security identical with what we should have had if we had taken that line a twelve-month ago, and had then announced our purpose to defend it against whatever government or whatever anarchy might dare to assail it.

Such, then, according to present appearances, is to be the termina-

tion of the war in which we involved ourselves by admitting Texas into our confederacy. The gain, as was expected, and as was probably intended, redounds to Texas and to the holders of Texan scrip. For all this addition to her territory—for the acquisition of millions of acres to which she had no more shadow of a right than she has to the island of Cuba, Texas pays nothing. The "man in the blanket," that renegade from civilization, Sam Houston, has outwitted and cheated not only President Tyler and Mr. Calhoun, but President Polk also, and all the democracy of the Union. The whole operation, from the first appeal to Mr. Tyler's vanity down to the present moment, shows that Houston is sharp in a bargain—too sharp for those with whom he has been dealing. Through his adroitness, the quarrel between Mexico and Texas, which Texas could not settle, has been settled by the resistless weight of our power and our resources. We have taken up the quarrel as our own; the common treasure and the common blood of all the United States, have been squandered in the conflict; and the result is, that Texas is to be the greatest, and ere long the most powerful state in the Union.

But after all the case is not as bad as it might be. In one respect the peace—supposing that it turns out to be a peace in the manner proposed—is even honorable to our country. We might have taken from Mexico much more of her territory than we have taken; for we had much more in our undisturbed possession, and some other frontier, still more advanced, might have been defended as easily as that which we assume for our boundary. But we content ourselves with comparatively little, when we might have had much. Nor is this all. What we have determined to keep, we might have kept without paying for it, just as easily as we can keep

it after the twenty millions shall have been paid. But we pay at a magnificent rate for all we take. Instead of doing as the British did in China—instead of taking what we think will be convenient for our use, and then exacting an indemnity of twenty millions from those whom we have conquered, we pay the twenty millions ourselves, and the indemnity goes—as of right it should go—to the party that has suffered most, and is most in need of it. All this, we claim, is really creditable to our country. In the long history of conquest and national robbery, since the days of Nimrod, we do not remember any thing half so generous. Alexander of Macedon had some heroic traits; but the thought of paying for any of the countries which he overran with fire and sword, seems not to have occurred to him. The Romans were a remarkably "progressive" people, and they had a "manifest destiny" to fulfill; but when did the Romans pay, or promise to pay, for any of the countries which they conquered and annexed to their widening dominion? When the Huns, the Goths and the Vandals, came down from the North on the decaying Roman empire, as our armies have come down upon enfeebled and decaying Mexico, executing the vengeance of God, they did not pay for the fair provinces they conquered. The Saracens were an enterprising people in their day; they went on annexing for several ages; but they never paid for Egypt or the Holy Land, or for the possessions which they held so long in Spain. The Turks took Constantinople four centuries ago; but to this day they have never paid for it. In more modern times, Napoleon seems always to have thought that the expense of conquering was enough, without assuming the additional expense of paying for what he conquered. Nor have the British ever had a thought of taxing themselves to pay for a single acre of all their

conquests in India. So far as our reading informs us, this paying for these Mexican provinces, and paying for them so magnificently, after having conquered them, and while still holding them and expecting to hold them only by mere force, is the first instance of the kind in the history of the world. The paying for these provinces, when we might just as well have them without paying, is certainly creditable to our country; though our taking them and holding them, in the old way of conquest and armed strength, is decidedly vulgar, putting us on a level, in that respect, with other aggressive and conquering races, the British, the French, the Turks and Saracens, the Goths and Vandals, and the old Romans. It is to be hoped that our example, so far as it is creditable, will not be lost upon the world. If other nations who may hereafter pursue the career of conquest, will do as we have done, this Mexican war of ours will become quite an epoch in history. One improvement may lead to another; and who can tell that ultimately there may not be found some way of conducting wars of invasion and conquest "upon Christian principles?"

But it is not our purpose to discuss in detail the programme of a peace which has been published under the name of a treaty. The action of the President and Senate on that paper, may be taken as evidence of a purpose on their part to bring the war to a close. We may assume therefore, that the war, so far as active hostilities are implied in the word, is virtually ended; that our armies are to be withdrawn from their present advanced positions; that the boundary between the territory which we claim and hold as our own, and that which we acknowledge as belonging to Mexico, is to be as described in the paper referred to; that those Mexicans residing this side of the new boundary

who choose to retain their allegiance to Mexico, will be allowed freely to do so and to sell their property and remove, or to remain where they are; while such as do not avail themselves of that privilege, will become citizens of the United States; and that these territories after a sufficient pupillage, and after having become sufficiently populous and properly organized to be invested with sovereignty, are to be admitted as sovereign states of this great Union. Assuming all this as determined, we look to see what is to be the result of it in respect to our public affairs, and how it affects our interests and duties as citizens.

It is obvious, in the first place, that certain great and grave questions which have agitated the minds of good citizens, are disposed of. Certain great issues have been before the country, but are now no longer to be debated. It is no longer a question what shall be done to bring this most mischievous and demoralizing war to a conclusion. The war is to be ended. It is no longer a question whether our members of Congress ought to vote supplies for the prosecution of the war. All the supplies now needed on account of the war, are supplies to pay the debts already contracted, and supplies to keep the peace upon our new Mexican frontier. It is no longer a question whether the war shall end in the acquisition of territory beyond the western boundary of Texas. The territory is acquired and will never be given up. It would be as wise to expect that Florida will be ceded back to Spain, and Louisiana to the French republic, as to expect that the provinces now acquired will pass again into the possession of Mexico. All these questions belong now to the past. So far as parties have been organized upon these questions, the parties must find some other issues or must be disorganized. Neither the war question in any of its forms,

nor any form of the question touching the policy of acquiring new territory, is now before the American people as a question to be by them decided. In a word, all the issues presented by Mr. Clay in his speech at Lexington last autumn, are already obsolete.

But in the next place, who does not see that another question, which both the great political parties have been anxious to evade lest it should swallow up all questions and all parties together, is not disposed of. The question of the extension of slavery beyond Texas, must now be met. It stands in the way of our mercenary statesmen and the asses which they ride, like the angel with a drawn sword in the way of the mercenary prophet.

The inevitableness of this question arises from the fact that arrangements must now be made, by the sovereign power of the United States as represented in Congress, for the temporary government of the countries which we have acquired beyond the Rio Grande. At this moment, whatever government exists in those countries is simply a military government like that which exists at Vera Cruz or at the city of Mexico; nor can any other kind of a government be established there, even temporarily, till it shall be established by act of Congress. Meanwhile all law is in abeyance except as put in force by orders from the military commander. No old law can be repealed; no new law can be made; *inter arma silent leges*. The municipal or local magistrate, if he proceeds in his functions, proceeds by an authority derived not from the old civil constitution of the country, but from a "general order" dated at "Head Quarters." The levying of taxes for local purposes, the enforced payment of debts, the adjustment of controversies among individuals, the settlement of estates, the protection of personal rights, the punishment of crimes, must all be

left undone, or must be done by the authority inseparable from a conquest and military occupation. No civil order can be established there, till the legislative power of the government for which those territories have been conquered, and to which they are now regarded as belonging, shall establish it. That legislative power is lodged nowhere else than in Congress. Till Congress shall by an act of legislation provide some civil government for those territories, and put the inhabitants under the protection of some system of laws, the only government there is the government of a military commander, and the only law is that commander's sense of right and of expediency, within the limits of his responsibility to his military superiors. Congress then is under an immediate necessity of acting to remove from those territories the merely military government under which they now are, and to give them, in the language of our institutions, a regular "territorial government" with a system of laws.

But what shall those laws be? The sovereignty over those territories is not in the fifty thousand or the hundred thousand Mexican inhabitants that happen to be resident upon that soil at the moment of the transfer. It is not for them therefore to say what the laws shall be that are to govern them and those who with them are to occupy that soil hereafter. Congress must determine that question. The most obvious and reasonable method of determining it would be by enacting that the laws heretofore existing in that country, so far as they are not inconsistent with the constitution of the United States, shall continue in force till repeated or modified by subsequent acts of legislation. Such a provision inserted in an act for the establishment of territorial governments in New Mexico and California, is the only arrangement which would be consistent with any

measure of justice toward the conquered people. No change in their laws should take place at present except such change as is inseparable from their new political relations. This is just what was done for the inhabitants of Louisiana, when they passed under the sovereign authority of the people of the United States as represented in Congress. This is just what was done in the case of Florida. It is, perhaps, within the constitutional power of Congress to declare that all the laws by which the provinces we are now acquiring, have heretofore been governed, are henceforth null; and to introduce there some entirely different body of laws, by a single stroke of legislative power:—but what an act of oppression would that be? It would be the very wickedness which Nicholas of Russia is now perpetrating against the inhabitants of conquered and dismembered Poland; the very wickedness which was the starting point, the original sin, of all the misrule which England has perpetrated in Ireland. It would be what England in all her career of annexation and conquest, has never done save in that unhappy isle which, after six centuries of oppression, she has not yet subdued.

If then the legislative power of the Union, which is now the only power that can give laws to the provinces we have acquired from Mexico, shall concede to the inhabitants of those provinces the whole body of their ancient laws so far as those laws can be enacted by Congress under the constitution of the United States,—what will be the result? First of all, the ecclesiastical establishment in those provinces, all that portion of their laws by which exclusive privileges and secular powers are given to the Roman Catholic religion and priesthood, falls to the ground; because it is written in the constitution that “Congress shall make no law re-

specting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” Next, all human beings on that soil, from the Rio Grande to the Pacific, of whatever lineage or complexion, are free; for by the laws of Mexico—laws that were in full force throughout those provinces at the moment of our conquest—the relation of owner and slave can not exist upon that soil. The territory which we have conquered is free territory and has been such for a quarter of a century; and Congress can establish no government over it—can not make the first movement in the discharge of the high responsibility which the acquisition throws upon the people of the United States—without deciding whether that territory shall be free territory still.

The capitalists of the South—not the free white people, but the capitalists—the comparatively few owners and vendors of slaves, who are of the aristocracy there, and who therefore think themselves the people—have set up a demand that not Texas alone, but all the regions beyond, shall be converted by act of Congress into a market for slaves. Thus shall the price of human flesh be kept up in the shambles of Norfolk and Richmond. Thus South Carolina and the seaboard of Georgia, now that they begin to suffer from the exhaustion of their soil, and from all the impoverishment so infallibly, though slowly produced by their semi-barbarous organization of society, shall feel themselves rich again for a season, in the increased price of negroes. The politicians of the South, whose sympathies of course are not with the laborers of their constituencies, but with the capitalists, are not satisfied with what they have gained in the annexation and enlargement of Texas. They demand that the free soil beyond shall become, by act of Congress, the extended area not of freedom but of slavery. They demand

that the legislation of the Union shall take care to infuse into the organization of those territories the virus of slavery. Congress must do this for them, and must do it by the votes of men deputed from the free labor states, and representing the sturdy masses of our free laboring population. Thus shall slaveholding states be established to maintain for ages to come the ascendancy which the slavery power has so long had in all the departments of the federal government. And now the question is, Shall the demand thus made by Southern capitalists and Southern politicians be conceded? We must meet that question. It can not be got rid of.

Our present purpose is not to argue the question, but only to show what the question is, and that it must be decided. We are not now attempting to show what Congress, in the exercise of its legislative function, may do, or what it may not do, in relation to the extension of slavery, without violating the constitution. Nor, admitting that it has all the power which the demand in question presupposes, do we now inquire what it may do, or may not do, in relation to slavery, without violating those eternal principles of right which God will not permit to be violated with impunity. We are only calling the attention of our fellow-citizens to the question actually impending, to the importance of it, and to the fact that it can not be evaded. We are not political partisans; we are neither democrats in the modern party sense, nor whigs, nor adherents of any third or fourth party; but we are freemen; we are Americans; we are responsible to God for all the influence we can exert at such a crisis upon such a question; and we call upon our fellow-citizens of all parties, and upon those who are of no party, to look at the transcendent importance of the question which has now arisen, and to act for the honor and the

welfare of their country in the fear of God.

Look at the nature of the question. Look at it as a question of public safety. It is the question whether to the elements of disaffection and disturbance already existing in those provinces—whether to a population of half tamed Indians, and long emancipated negroes, and conquered Spanish Creoles, on whom the boon of American citizenship has been in a measure forced, and whose revengeful spirits burn with a religious hate of Yankee domination, we shall attempt to add that no less combustible element—a population of negro slaves. It is the question whether upon that frontier, separated from Mexico by no natural barriers, we will place a population from which runaway slaves will be constantly escaping to freedom upon Mexican soil—fugitives whom no treaty requires the Mexicans to surrender, whom the law of nature and of natural sympathies requires them rather to protect, and whom the masters will therefore pursue in array of arms, shooting them down if they resist, and bringing them back in chains. It is the question whether we will bring upon ourselves the certainty of constant bloodshed on that distant frontier, and of speedy and perpetual war.

Look at it as a question of political economy. It is the question whether we shall put these new acquisitions of ours to such a use as shall most augment the great aggregate of our national wealth, and the rewards of the national industry. It is the question whether the population that is to spread over the hills and mountain plains of that vast and wild interior, and that will fill those sheltered nooks and narrow vales into which the soft west wind blows from the Pacific, shall be a pastoral and farming population, free, industrious and civilized, requiring for their consumption, in an indefinite supply, the cotton and sugar of the

South, the manufactured products of the North, and the golden harvests of the West, and paying for all they consume in the products of their industry; or a slave producing people, requiring for their consumption almost nothing of the products of other portions of the Union, and contributing to the internal commerce of the nation nothing, or almost nothing, but slaves born in the invigorating air of the far inland mountains, to be consumed by toil in torrid cane-fields and pestilential savannas around the gulf of Mexico.

Look at it as a question of national dignity and reputation. It is the question whether the arms and resources of the American people have been employed, their blood poured out on fields of battle, and their treasure lavished, to force on conquered and reluctant provinces, that disgraceful barbarism, that scoff and hissing of the civilized world, the institution of negro slavery.

Look at it as a moral question—a question of right and wrong in legislation. The question is not, what is expedient in order to our getting along for the present with an exacting and unscrupulous aristocracy, threatening to dissolve the

Union if they can not have their way?—but, what is right—how shall we get along under the government of God, with his eternal and omnipotent justice? The question is not, what is destiny?—but what is right? Right, O atheist, is greater and more awful than destiny. Do right, and let destiny care for itself.

Reader, as you are an American freeman, responsible to God for the trust devolved upon you, see that you do not overlook the importance of this question. The question is one of a grandeur so manifest, that in the view of any right minded man, it makes all other pending questions of our national policy insignificant. Who shall be president—who shall be senator—who shall be judge—questions like these are of no moment, save in their relation to the question of the crisis. Questions about the tariff and the treasury may be postponed; but this question stands before us in its august greatness, and it will not down at our bidding. It will be answered. He who would sacrifice such a question to any temporary, personal or party interests, wrongs his own moral nature, and betrays the great cause of universal humanity.

---

#### SUPPLEMENT TO ARTICLE ON THE SUBSTITUTION OF SECTARIAN FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS—p. 230.

SINCE our article on the Substitution of Sectarian for Public or Common Schools was printed, we have received, through the kindness of a very able and earnest friend of popular education, the statistical information to which we alluded in our note on page 238, as fully supporting our position that the children of our immigrant Roman Catholic population, can be made, by wise and liberal measures, to share the benefits of our common schools. This

information, which, we are assured, “may be implicitly relied on,” is so satisfactory and important, that we give it here in the form of a supplement.

The first communication is from Lowell, Mass.

Lowell, March 19, 1848.

*My Dear Sir*,—Yours of the 4th inst. was duly received, with inquiries which I proceed to answer.

1. Do the children of our foreign or immigrant population, especially

the Catholic portion of them, attend our public schools?

In the first settlement of Lowell in 1822, owing to several causes, the Irish were collected and built their dwellings chiefly in one quarter, on a tract of land known ever since as the *Acre*. A large population was here gathered, destitute of nearly every means of moral and intellectual improvement. It was next to be expected that a community thus situated and neglected, so near a populous town of New England people, could be viewed with indifference; on the contrary, it would be watched with great anxiety and apprehension. Accordingly, by the advice and efforts of philanthropic persons, a room was soon rented and supplied with fuel and other necessities, and a teacher placed there who was remunerated by a small weekly voluntary tax, I think, six cents a week for each child. From the poverty and indifference of these parents, however, the school was always languishing and became extinct. From time to time it revived, and then after months of feebleness again failed.

At the annual town meeting in May, 1830, an article was inserted in the warrant, for the appointment of a committee to "consider the expediency of establishing a separate school for the benefit of the Irish population." A committee thus appointed, reported in April, 1831, in favor of such a school. This report was accepted by the town, and as our schools were then carried on in districts, the sum of fifty dollars was appropriated for the maintenance of a separate district school for the Irish. Here was the first municipal regulation relating to this matter, and the origin of the separation between the two races. This district school had many vicissitudes for three years, kept only a part of the year as our other district schools were, and was often suspended because a suitable room

could not be had. On the whole, it was unsatisfactory as in 1834. The Catholic priest here appears to have been carrying on a private school under his church, which had been erected in this quarter. In 1835, this gentleman made formal application to the school committee for aid, and was present at several of their meetings. The result of these deliberations is thus detailed in the annual report of the school committee in March, 1836.

"It is known to the citizens generally, that various fruitless attempts have been hitherto made to extend the benefits of our public schools more fully to our Irish population. Those attempts have been hitherto frustrated, chiefly perhaps by a natural apprehension on the part of parents and pastors of placing their children under Protestant teachers, and in a measure also, by the mutual prejudices and consequent disagreements among the Protestant and Catholic children themselves. Your committee have great pleasure in stating that these difficulties appear to have been overcome, and the above most desirable object to have been finally accomplished.

"In June last, Rev. Mr. Conolly of the Catholic church applied to the committee for such aid as they might be able to give to his exertions for the education and improvement of the children under his charge. The committee entered readily and fully into his views, and in subsequent interviews a plan was matured and has since been put into operation. On the part of the committee, the following conditions were insisted on as indispensable, before any appropriation of the public money could be made:

"1. That the instructors must be examined as to their qualifications by the committee, and receive their appointment from them.

"2. That the books, exercises and studies should be all prescribed and regulated by the committee, and

that no other whatever should be taught or allowed.♦

"3. That these schools should be placed, as respects the examination, inspection and general supervision of the committee, on precisely the same footing with the other schools of the town.

"On the part of Mr. Conolly it was urged that to facilitate his efforts, and to render the scheme acceptable to his parishioners, the instructors must be of the Catholic faith, and that the books prescribed should contain no statements of facts not admitted by that faith, nor any remarks reflecting injuriously upon their system of belief. These conditions were assented to by the committee; the books in use in our other public schools were submitted to his inspection, and were by him fully approved. On these principles there were established that year, three schools for the Irish."

I have judged it necessary to give you these preliminary remarks, in order to explain our present position. By this mutual conciliation, we easily secured incalculable advantages; and from these small beginnings have grown up a class of large and highly respectable schools, gathered from our most degraded population. The Irish children may now be found in every school in the city in considerable numbers, even in our high school, while at the same time the separate Irish schools are crowded to overflowing, chiefly because the latter are in the vicinity of our densest Irish population.

We have had occasionally a Catholic priest who has tried to interfere, but without success. It is now years since these schools have been for a moment disturbed. All jealousy seems so to have disappeared, that I find now that we have but *four Catholic teachers* in our employ, and these females, while we have *nine schools* of Irish children exclusively. The original condition has gradually and undesignedly been falling into

neglect. The Irish parents, the more respectable of them, attend the exhibitions of their children with great delight and pride. These separate Irish schools, in point of discipline, are admirable, and in attainments are quite respectable.

The number of Irish children (and all our immigrants are Irish almost) who have been members of our public schools the past year, I estimate at 1800. I have not the means of giving you the number of our Irish population: and doubtless the number of children of Irish parents who attend no school is large. In every city, this is a fearful element of danger to us, and can not be viewed but with the greatest concern. We have, however, the consolation of believing that incalculable good is resulting to those who are drawn within the influence of this great safeguard of our liberties.

2. Are any, and how many deterred from attending the public schools, on religious grounds only?

The number must be extremely small: and if any, I could have no means of enumerating them.

I am, dear sir, respectfully and gratefully yours,

JOHN O. GREEN.

Hon. HORACE MANN.

The second communication is from Fall River, Mass. We give the substance of it. There are in that place fourteen public day-schools. The average attendance of each of these, for a week in March, 1848, is given, in figures approximating the truth as near as practicable, and likewise the attendance, in each, of Roman Catholic children. The sum of the former is 1189. The sum of the latter is 209. Two hundred and nine Roman Catholic children, out of eleven hundred and thirty-nine children in the public day-schools.

There are in the same town two Roman Catholic schools; one taught under the eye of the priest, and partly charitable; the other entirely

of a private character. The former averages sixty, the latter thirty pupils. These are all who are known by our informant to be "detected from attending the public schools on religious grounds."

The third communication is from Boston. We quote the following.

"I can not say what portion of our foreign population attend our public schools, not knowing how many there are in the city. But of 9838 children in the primary schools on the last day of January, 1848, 4644 were reported as of foreign parentage. This is by no means the whole number, as many teachers do not report how many they have, but say 'a few,' 'a great many,' 'a large proportion,' 'I can not say how many,' &c.

"Some of the children are Germans, English, &c., but the greater number are undoubtedly Irish.

"I am not aware that any are kept away from our schools on religious grounds. I know one Roman Catholic priest who not only encourages the attendance of his children at our primary schools, but provides them with clothing and the

necessary books, &c. to enable them to do so. He has been, or sent, to me many times for tickets of admission; and I presume I have admitted thirty or forty children at his request within three months. I have to-day admitted five. He also occasionally goes into the schools, and sees that they attend, and appears to take much interest in their attending. He tells me that the Bishop and their clergy feel friendly to our schools."

To this information we need not add any comments. It fully sustains our position, and is fitted greatly to gratify the friends of popular education and of our country. We are happy to be able to give it, and express hereby our obligations to those who have communicated it to us. The statements in the last communication require us to qualify, as we do with great pleasure, an observation in the first part of our article, respecting the general opposition of the Roman Catholic priesthood to the attendance of Roman Catholic children upon the public schools.

#### LITERARY NOTICES.

*The Germania and Agricola of Caius Cornelius Tacitus, with notes for Colleges.* By W. S. TYLER, Professor of the Greek and Latin Languages, in Amherst College. New York and London: Wiley & Putnam. 1847.

This book has already been favorably noticed by several other journals, and the commendations which it has received, though generally too indiscriminate, have nevertheless not been bestowed without reason. The aim of the editor has been to furnish the students of our colleges with the most approved text of these two treatises of Tacitus, together with such explanations and illustrations of the same, as, in his judgment, were needed. He has accordingly adopted, "in the main," the text of Walther, introducing a few

such deviations from him as were suggested by other critics and approved by his own judgment; and for "notes" has endeavored "to embody in small compass the most valuable results of the labors of such recent German editors as Grimm, Günther, Gruber, Kiesling, Dronke, Roth, Ruperti and Walther." This was a laborious undertaking. Indeed, it would be no slight task thoroughly to digest the condensed yet voluminous commentaries of Ruperti alone on this author. But when to this is added the similar study of each of the commentators named above, as well as the others, still more numerous, whose names appear on page 75, the whole to be followed by a careful comparison of them all, one with another, the labor becomes well nigh formidable. If, therefore, in executing his plan, the editor is found sometimes to have misapprehended his authorities, or to have stric-

hated to one what belonged to another, it should not in all cases be necessarily a matter of surprise. Nothing, however, is more important in a work of this kind, than accuracy; for, as it derives value, to a great extent, from the authority of great names, it is desirable that we know that their opinions are truly reported.

Besides the derived notes, there are many furnished by the editor himself, which, with the others, form a commentary of more than a hundred pages, and are destined, we doubt not, to render valuable aid to those for whom the book was particularly designed.

As the editor has in his preface intimated an intention of giving the public an improved edition of his book, it may not be amiss to illustrate the fault which we have pointed out above, by remarking for a moment on a few points presenting themselves within the compass of half-a-dozen pages, taken as a specimen of the work, presuming, however, that the errors discussed are generally such as would have been corrected by the editor himself, had he once more carefully revised his manuscript before sending it to the press.

If we turn to page 163, we find the following note. " *Auctus Oceanus, swelling ocean.* \* \* \* W[alch] says: *ocean boastfully described, but not so well!*" Now so far is Welch from translating *auctus* by the words *boastfully described*, that he rejects *auctus* from the text, and adopts and defends the conjecture of Lipsius, who substitutes *victus*, and gives the sentence as follows: *hinc terra et hostis, hinc victus Oceanus militari jacentia compararentur.*

The note at the bottom of the same page is on the following passage: *Caledoniam incolentes populi, paratu magno, maiore fama, uti mox est de ignotis, oppugnasse ultra, castella adorti, motum, ut prosoecentes, addiderant.* In his note the editor says: " *Oppugnasse* depends on *fama*. \* \* \* So Gro[novius], Dr[onke], W[alch], etc. W[althe]r would supply before *oppugnasse*, *uti nuntiatum est*, as implied in the context, which comes to the same result." This seems to us to be not only a very imperfect, but also an incorrect account of Walther's interpretation of this contested passage. In the first place, it represents that this critic and Welch essentially agree, whereas they differ as widely as two intelligent commentators well could; and secondly, the only point of difference which is mentioned, is stated incorrectly. For Walther does not supply *nuntiatum est* before *oppugnasse*, but *after* that word, and parenthetically. He makes *oppugnasse* depend not on this supplied verb, nor on *fama*, (which construction he maintains would require *adortus*), but notwithstanding the tense of the infinitive, on the participle *adorti*. He differs still more

widely from Welch in his construction of the words *paratu—ignotis*. The latter makes *majore* agree with *fama*. Walther makes it agree with *paratu*, and thus gives an entirely different turn to that part of the sentence, so that it must be translated: *after great preparation, which was exaggerated by report, as things unknown are wont to be.* We do not maintain that Walther's interpretation is to be preferred to the other, but that they differ widely, must, we think, be apparent.

On the next page, we are told that *Quod*, the first word of chapter 26, is the "relative for the demonstrative." But is this exactly true? Has not *quod* a use and a significance here which the demonstrative would not have? It may be that in English, where we do not link together our sentences and periods as it is customary to do in Latin, we should use the demonstrative to begin a sentence like this. But in saying this we assert something very different from the proposition in the note. We allude to this comparatively unimportant error, in order to make our objection to the use of such phraseology in general. We believe that learners are often misled by being told that this or that word, or case, or tense, or mood, is used for another, as if the substitution could be made without some change, greater or less, in the thought expressed, or some violation of the rules of the language, while the truth is, that it can very rarely be done. We find the same note repeated in explanation of the first word *cujus*, of the next chapter.

The last sentence of this chapter commences thus: *Quod nisi paludes texissent.* By a reference to chapter 12, we are told that " *quod* = proper *quod*, and means *wherefore, so that*." Prof. Tyler is here, we think, at variance with his best authorities. Does not Frouard (see *quod*, VII) point out the true use of this particle in this passage as well as in the others alluded to? See also Zumpt's Latin Grammar, § 807.

At the bottom of page 165, we find the note, " *Fortium virorum, military men.* Dr[onke]. This is not Dronke's interpretation, but Ernesti's, quoted by Dr., to be sure, as also by the editor of the *Tacitus* found in Lemaire's series, and probably by others.

Page 166. " *Quae—faceret = ut ea faceret*" Why is this simple case of the subjunctive explained, while *estimaret* in chapter 5, and *quaereretur* in chapter 14, are passed by unnoticed?

But we have already exceeded the limits of a "short notice," and time and the printer forbid us to enlarge. We will therefore turn but one leaf more, and close our remarks with a word on two of the notes on page 169. In the middle of the page stands the following: " *Quae—quod.* *Quod = quod attinet ad: whom,*

as to the fact that you have at length found, (it is not because) they have resisted, but they were overtaken." If *quod* = *quod attinet ad*, what is the object of *ad*? *Quod* is said sometimes to combine in itself all that is expressed by *quod attinet ad id, quod*. But is there any necessity of giving this word any other than its more ordinary meaning in this passage? The text is as follows: *quod quod tandem inventis, non resisterunt, sed deprehensi sunt.* We do not see that a literal translation of these words will be any more obscure than that contained in the note, thus: *and because you have at length found them, they have not resisted, but have been overtaken.* Agricola apprehends that some of his soldiers may infer that the Caledonians have come to a stand to oppose them, because they (the Romans) have at length found them in their remote retreats. He denies this concisely in the words given.

"*Quinquaginta annis.* So many years, it might be said to be in *round numbers*, though actually somewhat *less* than fifty years since the invasion of Britain by Julius Caesar." We know not how to account for the obvious and grave error of this note. Julius Caesar invaded Britain more than fifty years before Christ, and the exhortation which this note aims to explain, was delivered by Agricola to his soldiers more than eighty years after the commencement of the Christian era; the interval, therefore, in *round numbers*, was one hundred and forty, instead of fifty years. But Tacitus does not allude to the first expedition against Britain in this passage. He himself informs us, in chapter 13, that after Julius Caesar's campaigns in that island, its inhabitants enjoyed quiet from Roman vexation during the successive reigns of Augustus, Tiberius and Caligula, till *Claudius* renewed the project of bringing them into subjection, (A. D. 43.) From that year to the time when Agricola is represented as speaking in the passage under consideration, was a period of upwards of forty years; and this is the period which Agricola has in mind, calling it in *round numbers* fifty years.

We had intended to comment on some other points, which we think call for criticism on the few pages to which we have confined our remarks; but we have said enough to indicate the nature of the inaccuracies of which we complain. For the book, as a whole, the editor deserves and will receive the thanks of the public.

**CHASE'S APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.**—*The work claiming to be the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, including the canons; Whiston's Version, revised from the Greek; with a Prize Essay,*

*at the University of Bonn, upon the Origin and Contents.* Translated from the German; by LEON CHASE, D.D. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: George S. Appleton, 148 Chestnut Street, 1848.

THE Apostolical Constitutions, of which we have here an elegant translation, is one of the most important relics of Christian antiquity. Its claim to an Apostolical origin is now universally rejected by the learned, some assigning it to the third century, and others to a period as late as the sixth. No work of a similar title is mentioned by any writer until the latter part of the fourth century, or early in the fifth, when Epiphanius quotes from the "Constitution of the Apostles," which, he says, though held of doubtful authority by many, is not to be condemned since it contains a true account of the ecclesiastical discipline and laws." No other distinct mention of such a work occurs in any writer of the fourth century, nor until after the death of Theodosius the Great, about a hundred years later. This is all the evidence of the existence of the work which the first five centuries furnish, unless, as is conjectured by some, Eusebius and Athanasius refer to it under the title of the "Teachings" or "Doctrine" of the Apostles. It was formally condemned as spurious by the Trullan council, A. D., 692. The reader will perceive from these facts that this work deserves no credit as an exponent of the doctrines and discipline of the primitive church. Even if it had as early an origin as the third century, it was no doubt subsequently interpolated, and the character of it essentially altered. In doctrine, it is Arian; in church government, Episcopal; and in support of both it is of about equal authority—that is, of no authority whatever. Al-

though the main body of the work, came from one hand, yet it manifestly underwent alterations during two or three centuries to suit the exigencies of the reigning influence in the church. It came into existence in a corrupt age, after the doctrine had become current that deception may be lawfully practiced for the cause of religion, and after the want must have been felt for apostolic authority to support the new ecclesiastical ideas and usages. The age which produced it gave birth also to a multitude of other forgeries which were easily imposed on the world as the genuine works of the authors, whose names they bear. Whoever reflects upon the success of some modern authors in imposing their works upon the public as the productions of former times, can easily see with what facility the fraud might be committed in an age destitute of critics and printing presses, especially if the books were adapted to strengthen the interests of the heads of the church, into whose hands copies would first fall, and who alone would be competent to detect and expose the forgery. In such an age a book might be written with the name of an ancient author attached, with no design to deceive; yet afterwards, when its real authorship had died out of mind, it might be received without question as the work of him whose name it bears. Such, on one or the other of these suppositions, was the origin of the work before us. It was designed to realize the ideas which at the time of its composition had begun to prevail, of a Catholic church, under a hierarchy, constituted after the pattern of the Levitical priesthood. The first book which is short, is occupied mainly with rules for moral conduct and gives but few precepts respecting discipline. The second which is the central point of the whole work, contains some precepts respecting the character and con-

duct of the bishop, but is principally devoted to an exhibition of the subordinate relation in which the laity stand to the bishops. "The whole aim is to exalt the dignity and honor of the bishops above all, and in them to set forth the representatives, not only of the church, but of God." It distinctly exhibits the germ of that hierarchical principle on which rested, at a later period, the whole sovereign power of the priests, not over the church only, but also over the state. The bishop is to be supreme, but all other church officers are represented as worthy of great honor. The remaining books contain precepts concerning all the relations of ecclesiastical life, both internal and external; concerning festivals and fasts, divisions and schisms, and ritual and liturgical regulations. The eighth or last book contains the apostolical canons, eighty-five in number, many of which undoubtedly date back as far as the second century, others as late as the fourth. The prize essay of Dr. Krabbe of the University of Kiel, p. 236, is a very lucid and able exposition and discussion of every point of interest connected with these ancient writings, and adds immensely to the value of the volume. We have spoken of the "Constitutions," including the "Canons," as one of the most important relics of Christian antiquity. For although they can not boast of apostolic authority, they throw much light on the ecclesiastical usages of the early centuries, to which they must be referred, and also on the spirit of Christianity in those times. We can not better express this judgment than in the following words of the translator's preface:

"In reading these Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles, the Christian of the present day will be likely to exclaim, a splendid specimen of pious fraud! A strange mixture of good and of evil! He will readily perceive, however, that he has before him documents exceedingly important for illustrating the ecclesiasti-

cal history of a very remote period;—a period during a portion of which, at least, heathenism was dominant; the sighing of Christian prisoners was heard; the blood of martyrs was flowing. Here, too, are seen indications of the bitter controversies which rent the church before and after the Nicene Council, assembled by Constantine the Great, A.D. 325; here, some of the seminal principles from which gradually arose monasticism and the Papal hierarchy, and other great departures from the spirit and practice of the primitive Christians. And yet, with all the error, and superstition, and bitterness, and fraud, there is so much that is true, so much that is opposed to superstition, so much of kindness, moderation, and wisdom, so much of intelligence, and of acquaintance with the sacred Scriptures, so much that is elevated and manifestly Christian, so much that inculcates holiness upon the clergy and upon the laity, so much that is appropriate, and impressive in some of the liturgical pieces; and, for the most part, there is such a tone of earnestness and sincerity, that, in the absence of the lights which we now enjoy, multitudes might easily have admitted the claims here set forth to apostolical authority."

*The Philosophy of Christian Perfection, embracing a Psychological statement of some of the principles of Christianity on which the doctrine rests, together with a practical examination of the peculiar views of several recent writers on this subject.* Philadelphia: Sorin & Ball. 1848.

THIS work is anonymous; yet internal evidence shows it to be the production of a disciple of Wesley, whose views on the subject of Christian perfection, it aims to establish. Whoever the author is, the ability he displays in the entire management of his subject, is of a character which would do honor to the sacred profession in any sect. The theme is one so familiar in all its parts, that it does not seem to require of us a full synopsis of the contents of this particular work, though it is managed with uncommon originality and force; nor do our limits allow us to exhibit more than a few leading points, particularly those on

which the writer's views differ from the received ideas of his class. One remarkable feature of the work, considering the source from which it comes, is the rejection of the doctrine of physical depravity, which is incorporated in Wesley's system as well as in all the other evangelical creeds of his day. On this point our author's views accord well with the most prevalent belief of our New England divines—to us a most hopeful indication. We sympathize strongly with all free thinking and free writing—as we do with a free press—always excepting the licentious use—expecting from freedom better fruits, on the large scale, than from constraint and servility. And it cheers us to find a writer of our author's strength, seeking, independent of authority, to rectify the mistakes of his sect, by a calm and rigid demonstration of better views. It is gratifying also to find him a strenuous defender of the perpetual obligation of the divine law delivered to man before the apostasy, and setting it forth as the rule and standard of Christian duty. The opinion has been generally ascribed to Wesley and his followers, that the "law of love" is the standard of Christian perfection, and that this falls short of the claims of the original law, the standard of obligation to beings perfectly pure. In this our author claims that the meaning of Wesley has been mistaken, and that he in fact held that the original "law is abolished only as a law of works—only in the sense of admitting no repentance" and pardon—that "man is not now to be judged by it as originally administered—undeviating obedience no longer being the condition of salvation." We rejoice to hear this disclaimer, and hope it may prove to be the voice of the whole denomination. There was doubtless a confusion of ideas in the mind of the great founder of Methodism on this important topic, and he has not al-

ways expressed himself in perfect self-consistency. But if his followers can only accept the views of this treatise, there is no longer any difference of opinion on this point between them and us, and one more point of union is established. Having found that there is nothing in the nature of things to forbid the obedience of the Christian to the whole divine law, at any given time, our author easily concludes that Christian perfection is attainable in this life. But he rests the proof of the fact of such attainment, if we understand him, solely on the testimony of those who profess to reach it. They have the evidence, he thinks, in their own *consciousness*, that the perfect love of God is shed abroad in their hearts; and he also thinks that they may be assured of the same fact by "the witness of the Spirit." It is in this part of the work that the usual vigor of our author fails him, and he makes out but a sorry argument in support of the main point to be established. As a Wesleyan, writing on the doctrine of Christian perfection, it was incumbent on him to furnish proof—not that perfection is attainable, and its attainment a duty—not (we beg leave to differ from many of our brethren) that some may have become perfect—but that consciousness may assure the believer that the love of God in him is the purest and intensest within his capacity of feeling—the full extent of all divine claims upon him. His consciousness, or, if you please, "the witness of the Spirit," may assure him that he loves God—that he is a Christian—but how it can reveal to him that the love he feels measures his capacity and obligation—that he is perfect in love—it surpasses our ability to perceive. Nor do we wonder that our author has left this question untouched, for if it had once arrested the attention of his clear mind, he would have seen his position to be untenable. No man

can measure the strength of his affections, and ascertain their exact relation to his capacity and duty. He can only know that he loves one object more than another; and that he loves one ardently while he loves another less; but whether his affections have all the strength of the highest virtue, it is not within his capacity nor for his interest to know. He may have the Christian hope, and even assurance, without knowing that his obedience to God is complete, wanting nothing. It is well for him to believe, that there is some deficiency yet to be supplied; some ornament of the Spirit with which his soul is not yet adorned; something worthy still to be attained.

**TORREY'S NEANDER.**—*General History of the Christian Religion and Church, from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander, translated from the first, and altered throughout according to the second edition.* By JOSEPH TORREY, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in the University of Vermont. Volume second: comprising the second great Division of the History. Boston: published by Crocker & Brewster.

This volume covers a most interesting period of church history from the end of the Diocletian persecution, A. D. 312, to the time of Gregory the Great, A. D. 590. During this period the church underwent the most important changes, in relation to the state, to her own organization, and to her doctrines and discipline. The power of the clerical orders which had been from the earliest times constantly encroaching on the universal priesthood and equal brotherhood of the apostolic age, now gained the entire ascendancy. The progress of this usurpation is distinctly traced from its beginnings up to the final supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, over the churches

of the west. During this period, the church emerged from that state of external danger and depression, in which pagan persecution had held her, into a state of security and outward power and splendor, more favorable to the multiplication of converts to a nominal Christianity than to purity of faith and practice. In this period also, the great controversies of the ancient church respecting the mode of the divine existence, the nature of Christ, original sin, free-will, &c. arose; and many of the most distinguished, both of the Latin and Greek fathers, flourished, as Athanasius, Eusebius, Jerome, Chrysostom, Pelagius, Arius and Augustine.

In this great work of the first ecclesiastical historian in the world, there is everywhere apparent the Christian spirit, not superficial, but profound as his learning, a deep current pervading the whole narrative, and especially those parts which relate the experience of such men as Chrysostom and Augustine. In a discriminating portraiture of character, he excels all the other historians of the ancient Christian church; and he thus carries the reader back, to commune with the men of those times, and mingle in their conflicts. He displays in his account of the controversies, to some of which we have alluded, an ability as a dogmatic historian, not inferior to his nice power of discriminating character and tracing events to their causes. We should like to have all he has said of Pelagius and Augustine, combined in a volume, for general circulation. We are happy to express our satisfaction with the manner in which the translator has executed his arduous task in the preparation of this volume, it being much superior in style to the first which bears more marks of the German original. We are happy also of an opportunity of expressing a second time, our sense of obligation to him for this invaluable

contribution to English theological literature.

*Cleveland's Compendium of English Literature.*—E. C. & J. Biddle, No. 6 South Fifth street, Philadelphia, have just published a Compendium of English Literature, chronologically arranged, from Sir John Mandeville to William Cowper, consisting of biographical sketches of the authors, choice selections from their works, with notes explanatory and illustrative, and directing to the best editions and to various criticisms. By Charles Dexter Cleveland. This work is designed as a text-book for the highest classes in schools and academies, as well as for private reading; and it is, therefore, furnished with a course of questions for examination, which require the scholar to be able to state the principal events in the life of each writer, to give a more or less particular account of his works, to repeat, it may be, some of his finest passages, to tell in whose reign he flourished, and who were his distinguished contemporaries, &c. &c.; so that he may in the end have impressed on his memory the history of English literature. The want of such a work has long been felt; and we are pleased to find the want supplied in a manner so satisfactory. The selections appear to us to be made with good taste and judgment. They are adapted to enrich the mind of the scholar with noble sentiments and principles; to inspire in him a love for literary excellence; and to form his taste upon the model of the masters of the language; while at the same time, they acquaint him with the merits and peculiarities of the several writers, and guide him in a more extensive course of reading. The author, is no doubt indebted in part for his qualifications for this work, to his position, for many years, at the head of a female seminary; and his "Compendium" we suppose, is the result of a long course of

reading and practice for the benefit of his own pupils. We commend it to the attention of parents and teachers, as a work, original in plan, happy in execution, and promising to open a new era in the popular study of English literature.

*Chalmers' Miscellanies.*—Robert Carter, 58 Canal street, New York, is the American publisher of "the *Miscellanies, embracing reviews, essays, and addresses, of the late Dr. Thomas Chalmers.*" The work is prefaced by a brief memoir of the Author, and by his funeral sermon, preached by the Rev. John Bruce, of Edinburgh, a very eloquent and discriminating discourse. The *Miscellanies* themselves need no commendation. They may receive as they deserve, some further notice from us, in an article devoted to the life, character and writings of this eminent philosopher, philanthropist and divine.

*Schmitz's History of Rome.*—The enterprising publishers, Allen, Morrill & Wardwell, of Andover, Mass., have issued an edition, from the sheets of the English house, as they appeared, of a new "History of Rome, from the earliest times to the death of Commodus, A. D. 192, by Dr. Leonhard Schmitz, F.R.S.E., Rector of the High School, Edinburgh." Other houses, we believe, have felt encouraged by the high reputation of the author, to publish his work in this country, paying no respect to the rule of honor, which, in the absence of the protection of copyright, concedes to the first publisher the exclusive possession of the market. Dr. Schmitz is a native of Germany, and a pupil of the celebrated Niebuhr, whose Lectures on Roman History, he, several years ago, gave to the English reader. In the work before us, his design is to provide a history of Rome for the use of schools and colleges, as well as for general reading, em-

bodying the results of the investigations of German scholars, from Niebuhr downwards. The period over which he has extended the history, is the most important to be studied in the annals of Rome, embracing persons, institutions and events of the greatest interest and most instructive to the young. He was qualified for this task, by his familiar acquaintance with both the German and English languages, affording him the materials of history from the best authorities, and enabling him to convey into "English undefiled" the fruits of German research, during the last half century.

*HYDRAULICS AND MECHANICS.*—A Descriptive and Historical Account of Hydraulic and other Machines for raising Water, ancient and modern; with observations on various subjects connected with the Mechanic Arts, including the Progressive Development of the Steam-Engine. Descriptions of every variety of Bellows, Piston, and Rotary Pumps, Fire-engines, Water-Rams, Pressure-engines, Air-Machines, Eolian-pipes, &c. Remarks on Ancient Wells, Air-Beds, Cog-Wheels, Blowpipes, Bellows of various People, Magic Goblets, Steam Idols, and other Machinery of Ancient Temples. To which are added Experiments on Blowing and Spouting Tubes, and other original Devices. Nature's Modes and Machinery for raising Water. Historical Notices respecting Siphons, Fountains, Water Organs, Clepsydra, Pipes, Valves, Cocks, &c. In Five Books. By THOMAS EWANK. Illustrated by 300 engravings.

THIS work is now in a course of republication by Greeley & McElrath, Tribune Buildings, N. Y., in eight parts or numbers at 25 cents each—half the price of the previous editions. We have looked into

some of the numbers with interest, finding them not dry details of art apart from all ornament, and intelligible only to men of science, but replete with historical incidents, sometimes instructive and always amusing, so that the reader is beguiled through all the tasks imposed on his attention by the scientific parts of the work. It is not only entertaining as a history of the progress of the mechanic arts, in respect particularly to hydraulics, but communicates information of great importance both to the philosopher and the practical mechanician. The first book in eighteen chapters comprises a narrative of the various primitive and ancient devices for raising water; the second, in seven chapters, describes the machines for raising water by the pressure of the atmosphere; the third, in nine chapters, develops the mechanics for raising water by compression, independently of atmospheric influence; the fourth, in nine chapters, displays the machines for raising water, chiefly of modern origin, including early applications of steam for that purpose; and the fifth, in nine chapters, unfolds the novel devices for raising water, with an account of syphons, cocks, valves, elepsydræ, &c.; the seventh chapter of which condenses a large amount of information on the subject of fountains; and this is "followed by an attractive elucidation of hydraulic organs." This synopsis, though very imperfect, will suggest to the reader, who feels an interest in such topics, what a rich fund of information he may expect to find in this volume.

*Miscellaneous Essays and Discourses*; by MARK HOPKINS, D.D., Pres. of Williams College. Boston: T. R. Marvin, 1847.

THIS collection includes all the previous publications of the author which have appeared in periodicals,

or in separate pamphlets. It commences with an *Essay on Mystery*, first published in the *Journal of Science* for 1828, which we remember well to have read in our boyhood with peculiar interest. It gives an exhibition of the mind of the author, not only as illustrated by his method of treating various topics, but also in its progress—through more than twenty years. We need not say that these discourses are all interesting and attractive, nor that some of them are of the very highest order of merit. There is a felicity and charm about all the efforts of Dr. Hopkins which need no praise from us—but which we count it a privilege to praise—inasmuch as he is one of the men of whom our common New England has most reason to be proud.

*A Practical Course of French Grammar based on Ollendorff's New Method, being an enlarged and improved plan, calculated to insure facility in conversation, together with an analytical knowledge of the language.* For the use of American Students. Second Edition. By G. J. HUBERT SANDERS. Griffith & Smith, Philadelphia.

The experience of Mr. Sanders as a teacher of the French language, enabled him to discover some imperfections in the French and London editions of Ollendorff's New Method, reprinted in this country; and this work is the result of an endeavor on his part to furnish one on the same plan, in which, he says, the models are more systematically arranged, and other important improvements introduced. Not having at hand the means of comparing the two works, we pronounce no opinion of their relative merits, but recommend this to teachers as admirably adapted to facilitate the acquisition of the French language. Ollendorff's plan is too well known,

and its reputation too well established, to need any commendation.

*Notes Critical, Explanatory and Practical on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah.* 2 vols. 8vo. By ALBERT BARNES. Second edition, revised and corrected. New York: Leavitt, Trow & Co., 191 Broadway.

THE Author of this work has the merit of having done more than any other man to disseminate among the mass of Christians in this country, a critical acquaintance with the scriptures—critical in respect to a knowledge of the exact meaning of the sacred text. His volumes upon the New Testament have been for years in the hands of Sabbath school teachers and scholars, most of whom would otherwise have had no adequate helps to the thorough mastery of their lessons. Others, in other relations, have derived an equal benefit from the possession of these cheap yet ample commentaries on the word of God. The volumes before us on the “Evangelical Prophet,” we regard as the Author’s *chef d’œuvre*, on account of the critical difficulties encountered, and the success with which he has surmounted them.

We find by us a number of pamphlets, some of which deserve a more extended notice than we are able to bestow on them collectively. Prof. Porter’s “Plea for Libraries,” has been republished in this form by “the Society for the promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West;” and is sent forth “in the hope that it may arrest the attention of many an individual who has the ability and the heart to do a noble work for the West,” by contributing to furnish its infant colleges with ample libraries—a hope which it is of the first importance should be realized.

A discourse on “The Moral In-

fluence of Manufacturing Towns,” by the Rev. Henry M. Dexter, of Manchester, N. H., contains many just and weighty thoughts on a subject, of growing interest to this country. On one incidental point we think his reasoning unsound. Speaking of the deficiency of church sittings in our large manufacturing towns, he gives it as his opinion, that not more than one half the people in any of them can be brought under the appropriate influences of the Sabbath. He instances Lowell and Manchester, where the number of church sittings is only equal to about one half the population; and his inference is, “that about *one half* of the population must necessarily be excluded;” and that “great multitudes *must* be habitually absent from the salutary atmosphere of the house of God,”—overlooking the fact, that a large number of the inhabitants are under the church-going age—others sick and superannuated—and thousands attending but once a day, alternating with other members of their families—besides another class who would not enter the house of God were one erected in every street.

It may seem late in the day to acknowledge the receipt of the spirited poem of Mr. Luzerne Ray, one of our valued contributors, delivered at the last anniversary of the Alpha of Connecticut. We advert to its publication in the way of an advertisement to any of our readers who who may wish to possess a copy—having listened to its delivery with that high satisfaction which every one capable of appreciating poetic conception, harmony and sentiment, must have experienced.

We have also to acknowledge the receipt of two discourses, delivered before literary societies by the Hon. George P. Marsh, M. C. from Vermont. Subjects: “The American Historical School,” and “Human Knowledge.” In the former, he points out “the general character

of existing historical literature, the uses of historical knowledge, and the conditions which the peculiar character of our institutions requires in the American historical school ;" the latter, in despite of its unpromising title, is the eloquent oration pronounced before the Massachusetts Alpha of the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Cambridge, in 1847. Both of these discourses display the erudition and philosophical spirit for which the author is distinguished. It is no small honor to Vermont, reflecting honor also upon the whole country, that she is represented in the national legislature, by one of the ripest scholars of the age.

"The Position and Duties of the North with regard to Slavery," from the pen of the Rev. Andrew P. Peabody, of Portsmouth, N. H., which first appeared in the *Christian Examiner*, is now published by itself for general circulation—a distinction of which it is eminently worthy. It exposes the sophistical arguments by which interested parties have endeavored to suppress the agitation of the subject of slavery—showing that the people of the free states are responsible, to some extent, for its existence, and pointing out the measures which it is incumbent on them to pursue. Whoever wishes to promote the diffusion of sound views on

this great and vital question, can do it in no way more effectually than by extending the circulation of this pamphlet. Published by Chas. Whipple, Newburyport, Mass. 1848.

"The Thirty-First Annual Report of the American Colonization Society," for 1848, is a document of unusual importance, containing a full history of the organization of the colony of Liberia into an independent republic, the national constitution, the inaugural address of the first President, and other papers of deep interest. The government is not constituted upon the model of the United States, but has features suggested by the experience of our country, and is well adapted to the condition of that people. We may mention as among the most peculiar features, the prohibition of slavery, the exclusion of all but persons of color from citizenship, and the exemption of the property of married women from responsibility for the debts of their husbands. The population of the new Republic, now more than eighty thousand, together with the progress already made by the people in all that constitutes national greatness, is prophetic of a splendid career of social prosperity.

---

POSTSCRIPT.—The note on page 211 is not from the pen of the writer of the article, but editorial. Our design was merely to express *our* regret that Mr. Secretary Mann, by making, in an official report, an offensive statement of the views entertained by a portion of his fellow-citizens on an important point of religious doctrine, has given occasion for the suspicion that he intended to use the influence of his office for a sectarian purpose. If however the effect shall be to lead some of the editorial guardians of orthodoxy in Massachusetts, to renounce and denounce the dogma of physical depravity, the churches of that Commonwealth will be in some sense indebted to the Secretary.

THE  
NEW ENGLANDER.  
No. XXIII.

JULY, 1848.

COMMON SCHOOLS AND THEIR RELATIONS TO  
HIGHER SEMINARIES.

THE system of common or free schools so generally prevalent in this country is mentioned with praise in all lands. It has conferred a most honorable distinction on that section of the American Union, where primary schools for the training of all the children and youth of the state, at the public expense, were first established, and where, from the first, they have been sustained with a constantly increasing interest in the popular mind.

It is to the lasting honor of New England that along with so many of the elements of her most ancient institutions, infused into the national character, this principle especially of universal popular education, has already become a national sentiment.

The fathers of New England were fortunate, not only in their efforts to found a new empire which should be the home of a free people, but they were fortunate also above all other founders of new states, that they apprehended clearly from the first, the grand features of a policy which must prevail, when their infant institutions should become vigorous and mature. They founded a new and noble empire, and designated the true methods of making that empire immortal.

Fully aware that their systems of civil and church polity implied as an absolute condition of success, the existence of great "maturity of reason" and a high standard of public morality, they aimed both to instruct the people and the teachers of the people in the best manner possible. Thus would the commonwealth be furnished with wise counselors and the churches with learned pastors, and the people would be able to appreciate the instructions of their public teachers, and judge for themselves of the conduct of all their public servants.

Their efforts grew out of their firm convictions that the truth for which they had suffered so much, and contended with so much success, would make free, even as they themselves were free, both their descendants and all who should embrace it. They were familiarly acquainted with all the forms and results of European civilization, and they were willing to abandon them in the hope of "a better country." They most highly prized the schools and universities of the old world, for their leading statesmen and pastors had enjoyed all the advantages of those seats of learning, and it was by means of the mental train-

ing thus enjoyed, that their own views of civil polity and religious doctrine were formed, and they were thus enabled afterwards to establish, wisely and judiciously, the foundations of a new state.

Knowing that they themselves must pass away, and leave to others their labors unfinished, they saw that their own great conceptions and their own far-sighted policy would be poorly transmitted to future ages by tradition. They knew the utter impossibility of maintaining a commonwealth after their model, if the people were ignorant or swayed by brute passion. Their rulers must be men of enlightened wisdom, while both the rulers and the people were to be alike submissive to the restraints of Christian morality. And therefore, as the author of the first written history\* of Harvard College has told us, "For some little while there were very hopeful effects of the pains taken by certain men of great worth and skill, to bring up some in their own *private families for public services*. But much of uncertainty and of inconveniency in this way was in that little time discovered; and they soon determined that *set schools* are so necessary, there is no doing without them. Wherefore a college must now be thought upon—a college, the best thing New England ever thought upon." Thus did they found their university, and every where in all the settlements, as soon as comfortable habitations had been provided for themselves, the house of public worship and the house for public instruction arose simultaneously, thus showing the inseparable connection in the minds of the earliest colonists between their religious and educational institutions and the life of their infant commonwealths.

The system of popular education in New England, was one which was designed, not only to meet the

wants of the people in the first generations, but it was wisely adapted to all the changes of growth and progress from the feeblest beginnings to the full vigor and maturity of the national life. In the year 1647, eleven years after the founding of Harvard College, and more than two hundred years ago, it was ordered, "to the end that learning may not be buried in the graves of the fathers, that every township, after the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty households, shall appoint one to teach all children to read and write, and when any town shall increase to the number of one hundred families they shall set up a grammar school, the masters thereof being able to instruct youth so far as they may be fitted for the university."

The general outlines of this system, thus early completed, have remained to this day essentially unchanged. The division into three grades of schools, arose naturally from the wants of the community; each claiming the popular sympathy and support according to their relative importance; each contributing essentially to the efficiency of the entire system of public instruction.

The fathers of New England paid but little regard to the forms of European society when they formed their civil constitutions. They looked with still less favor upon most of the systems of church polity belonging to the old world. They thought the tri-fold distinction of orders and officers in the Christian church, though ancient, was yet unscriptural. They merged the titles and duties of bishop, presbyter and deacon into that of a pastor of a laity church. But in their system of public education, we find three grades of offices and three orders of teachers clearly developed. We think these distinctions will be likely to remain so long as the genuine Puritanism of New England continues in a thriving condition.

\* Mather's *Magnalia*. Book 3.

The New England system of popular education may well claim, therefore, the admiration of the world, as being the earliest ever devised, as well as one of the most successful. It is yet in the full vigor of youth, though it be among the oldest of our ancient institutions. It has contributed very much to make us what we are, as a free and mighty people. It is that on which we must still depend for all we hope to be.

In very recent times systems of popular instruction have been formed in other lands, and much has been said in praise of their success. They have been introduced into countries where the manners of the people and the whole social organization has differed entirely from our own. These efforts to elevate the condition of the lower classes in Europe, claim the respect and sympathy of America. Their systems of education should be mentioned to the lasting renown of the enlightened statesmen who formed and introduced them. In these days when the eyes of the world are watching with such interest the popular revolutions of Continental Europe, the influence and results of popular education should be noticed in those countries where so much has been done to disseminate elementary instruction during the last twenty years. They should be attentively examined by such as would seek to improve the schools of our own land. Whatever illustrates the philosophy of popular education; whatever pertains to the best methods of teaching and school management; whatever contributes to the elevation of teaching as a useful and honorable profession, should be greeted with entire liberality, though coming from a foreign land. As the Romans when masters of the world, hesitated not to imitate the arms of their vanquished foes wherein they surpassed their own, so should we never deem it dis-

honorable to adopt improvements, let them come from what source they may. At the same time let not a blind admiration of foreign systems of education cause us to forget that we have a system of our own, with features strongly marked as American; a system long tried and successful. Especially should the aims and tendencies of the various systems be compared. The most complete educational processes applied under the most favorable circumstances, will not transform in a single generation, the manners and sentiments of an entire people into those of a people different in temperament and accomplishing a different destiny. The forms of government throughout Europe may be revolutionized; the thrones of every monarch may share the fate of that of Louis Phillippe, but the French or German republican will not therefore resemble a citizen of the United States, save only in the feeling of hostility to monarchy. Political revolutions may affect greatly the foreign relations of a people; but when an entire change is made in all the educational influences which form the character of the rising generation, then the very life of the nation is affected. The old nation dies and a new empire is born.

In this transition period, therefore, when we know not what a day may bring forth as to the stability and character of the oldest and most influential European nations, it becomes us to watch with jealousy, the tendencies of these new movements on the character and fortunes of our own people. And when modes and systems of education are presented for our adoption, with the assurance that they have worked well in foreign countries, we should look at the ultimate designs of those systems where they originated, and ascertain whether they conflict with the great ends of the American system of popular education. Noth-

ing marks the whole structure of American society more than the perfect supremacy of the principle of adaptation which is made the test of every thing which claims to be useful. Let this test be applied to every proposed modification of the American system of education coming from a foreign land.

Nor will this censorship, be it ever so rigidly applied, delay the progress of real improvement. It will not tend to lower at all the standard of attainments, or diminish the industrial activity of the pupils, in any of our literary institutions. In these respects our predecessors have never laid any claim to perfection—and there is yet to be reached a limit not discerned by our eyes in the progress of improvement. This fact, however, does not render it the less necessary to refer to the plans and search for the true aims of those who have gone before us. They have done that which entitles them to the gratitude of all their descendants. They have committed to us the completion of a work not yet accomplished though perfect in its design, like the building of the ancient cathedrals, needing generations and centuries even, yet perhaps, to complete the original plan.

But do we not claim more for our predecessors than is actually their due? How can we presume to speak with respect of the schools and modes of instruction belonging even to recent periods in our history? It is thought proper to extol the virtues and wisdom of our fathers for what they did in the cause of civil liberty and religious freedom, but in all that pertains to the managements of schools and methods of teaching, the present age is so much in advance of former times that we may say—

“Let the dead past bury its dead.”

We recur not to the past because we think the former days were bet-

ter or equal to these in respect to the facilities or means of instruction. Every grade of schools in this country has exhibited most surprising marks of progress in all that pertains to the machinery of education. “It is wonderful,” said President Woolsey in his inaugural address, “what improvements have been made in collegiate instruction during the last twenty-nine years,” the period of his predecessor’s administration. The standard of attainments in the preparatory schools has advanced in proportion, so that the amount of classical learning now acquired at Andover and Exeter by candidates for the freshmen classes of Harvard and Yale, is greater than at the time of graduation at those colleges half a century since. And common schools in the days of the Revolution, in respect to external appearances, would compare with the same grade of schools in our times, much in the same way that the plain sideboard of General Washington compares with the princely furniture, which surrounds it in the East room of the President’s palace.

If all the essential forms and institutions of society in the first days of the republic were simple and unobtrusive, and there was little to attract the attention of those accustomed to the conveniences and refinements of modern modes of life, still those times were adorned by the presence of shining virtues and noble men. The same facilities for instruction were not enjoyed, but the great end and aim of all learning was well understood by those who had the management of affairs in church and state.

Whenever questions of political philosophy or theories of civil government or church polity are discussed, nothing is more common than to refer to ancient usages and constitutions, not indeed for the purpose of imitating the external forms, now grown obsolete, but to search

for the elemental principles of truth which gave vitality to those forms, and still live in those that have superseded them.

Can nothing be learned in the philosophy of popular education,—its proper uses and ends in such a country as this, from the study of a system as ancient as the settlement of the country? Can not something be learned of the mutual relations of each grade of our schools to each other, and how they stand connected with the welfare and glory of the commonwealth, by the study of a system which dates back to Plymouth Rock for its origin, and which has been sustained ever since with unwavering constancy, with an ever growing interest?

It is very true that literary institutions of every grade in this country differ very much from the schools of Europe, even from those bearing the same name. It is doubtful whether an institution, modeled after the English or German universities, will be established in this country, although there can be no doubt but that, in the mature ages of American civilization, there will be found on this soil, institutions of learning equal in respectability to those of the old world.

The same will hold true of schools of lower grades. The conditions and circumstances of the pupils in different countries, will render necessary, different standards of attainment, and call for various modes of teaching, and different modes of discipline. If this rule were observed when comparisons are instituted between the literary institutions of the old world and the new, there would be less of that wholesale disparagement of our higher schools we sometimes hear, because we have not as yet in this country a grade of institutions similar to the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge, and on the other hand, there would be less tendency to discard institutions properly and naturally Ameri-

can. Let Paris rule, as hitherto, the fashions of the civilized world, if she must. Let her pride herself in the exercise of a power whose monthly mandates all our republican tailors and mantua-makers tremble to disobey, but why must we follow the speculations of French republicans and socialists as genuine philosophy? Why bow with so much reverence to theories of social and political life, whose "local habitation" is in the Cloud Land of German transcendentalism? The ready credence given to many foreign theories of education, and the earnest effort to realize them by introducing them into our institutions, at the same time discarding what is properly the growth of our own soil, proves any thing, but a free and independent spirit. The position we occupy, the destiny we are to accomplish, one would think, might teach us what a truly noble and proud people would not be slow to learn. While it is most evident that the facilities for gaining knowledge have greatly increased and important improvements have been made in the modes of imparting instruction, in all our schools of every grade, are we quite sure that an apprehension, clear and definite in proportion to these facilities and improvements, prevails as to the proper uses of learning and its relations to the public welfare? It is no disparagement to modern improvements, to say that if our predecessors did not enjoy our advantages for acquiring learning, they did very clearly appreciate its proper and highest ends, and because their means were limited and the processes of acquisition more expensive and laborious, they might perhaps, for these reasons, be less liable to mistake the means for the ends of learning, and be less likely to suffer the show of mere knowledge to take the place of true intellectual culture. And, most certainly, it was because the relations of

learning to the wants of society in New England, were clearly seen, that even the scanty means of our fathers were so productive of useful results, and the schools which now might be called comparatively poor, were, to former generations, a priceless blessing.

It is now often a theme for pleasure, to hold up, for the amusement of the young, the rude, rough apparatus of education, such as used to be employed no longer ago than the recollection of the "oldest inhabitants," and was entirely satisfactory to the scholars of those days because nothing better could be had. We meet these contrasts, not only in the lectures of common school agents, on the best methods of constructing school-houses and ventilating school-rooms. The shades of President Stiles and the Dominic Sampsons of "sixty years since," are not allowed to repose quietly on commencement festivals and College Alumni meetings.

And if half a century has wrought such changes, what shall be thought of the schools and teachers of still more primitive times? History is not wholly silent respecting the schools and colleges of the first ages of New England. We have heard of Master Ezekiel Cheever, the "father of Connecticut schoolmasters," who early settled in New Haven colony and died at the age of ninety-four, having been a "skillful, painful, and faithful schoolmaster for seventy years." It seems that teaching was a regular profession in those days. Cheever was the author of an *Accidence*, a famous school-book in its day, he being the first, so far as we know, among the New England schoolmasters, to write his own text-book of instruction; thus early setting an example which many of the best teachers of our times seem ambitious to imitate.

Cotton Mather has mentioned in his *Magnalia*, one Nathaniel Eaton,

the teacher of the first grammar school in Cambridge, which, under his successor, President Dunster, was honored with the name of a college. Being somewhat avaricious and excessively severe in school discipline, and finally having apostatized from the Puritans and become an Episcopalian, Mather says, that "he was a blade who marvelously deceived the expectations of good men concerning him, and yet he was a rare scholar and made many more such, though they were taught in the school of Tyrannus."

It may perhaps be soberly thought by some that the schools and teachers of the first generations were of no real service. Placed by the side of the schools of this wonderful era, it may be asked, could such meager foundations, such rude apparatus, such wretched text-books have served any valuable ends? Surely our "patent modes of teaching," our beautiful apparatus and spacious school edifices, our text-books of such rare excellence and in such numbers too, that a new work in every science is published once a quarter, must have all sprung at once from a perfect chaos of ignorance, and it can not be possible that this glorious era of light and knowledge which we witness, is in any way related to those barbarous ages. So far as regards the present condition or future glory of the American people, would it not have been about as well if Harvard and Yale had each been founded at least a century *later* in their respective commonwealths?

It does however appear to be a fact attested by veritable history, that New England, at least prior to the Revolution, was a land famous for its free schools, that at that time, the foundations of a great nation were laid by a people unsurpassed in the world for their general intelligence, and that even then the system of education which now is our

boast, had existed for generations, and had been sustained without the aid of boards of education or other useful agencies on which we depend for the advancement of learning. The Puritans did really more than devise an excellent theory of popular education. They transmitted to after ages more than the record of a well meant endeavor, although the fact, that they originated the conception and designated the method by which all the youth of the commonwealth might obtain the rudiments of an education, has gained for them the admiration of mankind. But they reduced their immortal conception to a historic reality. Not in some fancy model of a republic, but in their earliest constitutions we find this recognized as an elemental principle, that every person is born with the right of instruction, that if parents or guardians fail to fulfill their own natural obligations in this matter, their children must be educated by the state.

Nor did they stop here in their great endeavor to form a free and enlightened commonwealth. The common school with them was neither the beginning nor the end of measures deemed by them essential. The entire system of education in New England was popular in all its parts. That system embraced the university and the college no less than the primary and grammar schools. This was the ancient theory. It ought to be the modern theory. A system with all its parts so vitally interwoven, should never be separated so as to leave the interests of the higher or lower grade of schools to the care and sympathies of different classes of the community. The higher can not dispense with the lower. The lower can never be so much improved as that the higher may be dispensed with. The college, therefore, must never forget or fail to fulfill its popular functions, nor should any theory of common school education be for a

moment sanctioned, which excludes the principle of an intimate and vital relation of dependence upon the higher seminaries. We sometimes hear it said with apparent seriousness, that the common school is the "people's college," as though there was any thing but rhetoric in the phrase, or any thing but an abuse of language and the grossest error as to the true idea of a college. Still more frequently is the idea thrown out by Jacobinical editors and flippant demagogues, that colleges and higher seminaries exist for the benefit of a favored class, and are therefore aristocratic rather than popular in their uses and tendencies. Incalculable mischief is the result of these most dangerous errors, for on the one hand, they tend to diminish the proper influence of the higher seminaries, to weaken the sympathy of the public mind in their prosperity, and create a prejudice against those who enjoy their advantages. On the other hand, they introduce the most extravagant notions and systems of popular education. Opinions are maintained by the professed advocates of universal education, utterly subversive of all the great ends for which our ancestors established their system of free schools.

Until a recent period the true relation of dependence of the lower institutions upon the higher seminaries, was every where admitted, even in the popular mind. The fathers cherished the college with their warmest sympathies, and, in proportion to their means, with liberal contributions. On the other hand, there went forth from the universities and higher seminaries, the strongest impulses and influences in favor of popular education. If the mutual relations of the higher and lower seminaries be looked at historically, it will be found that progressive movements have begun in the higher and not in the lower seminaries. The elevation of the

standard of admission to the colleges has been followed by a corresponding advancement in the course of instruction in academies and high schools. Better furnished candidates being thus prepared for the learned professions and the business of teaching, a quickened activity is thus imparted to all the lower grades of schools in succession, and the sensibility of the popular mind is increased in favor of improvement and progress in every department of the general system, so that no more safe or certain plan of elevating the condition of the primary schools could be devised, than to enlist a deep interest among the people in the prosperity of our colleges and higher seminaries.

Such has been the practical working of the system which has hitherto prevailed. But unless we mistake, signs of a new order of things are manifest. It is becoming fashionable of late, to entrust some of the most important interests of the body politic, to the oversight of particular associations and agents. The idea seems to have been borrowed from the mode of conducting many of the moral and religious enterprises of the day. However efficient such an arrangement may be in enterprises where the business is chiefly executive and financial, we doubt the expediency of introducing the "division of labor" principle to advance the cause of education, by providing for one particular class of schools so exclusively, as to create a strong public impression which shall also be exclusive, and thus become prejudicial to another great interest. The members of the Boards of Education established in New England, are men high in the respect and confidence of the respective states to which they belong. They have devoted themselves to their patriotic work with great zeal and success. But their duty is limited to the oversight of the primary schools. In the voluminous reports

presented to the legislatures of their respective commonwealths, no information is given respecting the condition of academies or colleges. The state of New York furnishes an exception, the Regents of the University having under their supervision all the public literary institutions, which have received the patronage of the state.

We think the tendency of the arrangement generally in use, is to lead the people to think that common schools alone can properly claim the sympathy and support of the commonwealth, and that the higher institutions must be sustained by individual munificence, though they confer on the whole population incalculable benefits. We believe our colleges will be sustained, and continue to pour forth blessings, though left to the support of the friends of liberal education. Still it is very obvious, that a large part of our population are indifferent to their prosperity, while by not a few they are regarded with jealousy and open hostility. The existence of these adverse popular prejudices, tends greatly to circumscribe the influence of those who receive the advantages of a liberal education, and who in general fully appreciate the great work they aim to do, and are doing. Most of the commonwealths of New England have long since withdrawn all patronage from colleges and academies. And where it is not altogether withheld, it is given as it were grudgingly, with extreme hesitancy, more from motives of partisan policy, than from any real interest felt in behalf of those institutions, in the legislatures of the people. That state who rejoices in the appellation of "Mother of States," makes her boast of her School Fund, which is indeed managed by a most prudent and discreet financier, and thus affords ample means to produce most meager results; while Yale College, her richest, proudest ornament, has long

since ceased to look for legislative endowments, though resorted to as a National University by students from every state in the Union. Even Massachusetts has lost her ancient renown, gained by her early liberality to Harvard University. While we write, we are pained to learn that a most useful project designed to benefit all her colleges, has failed in the popular branch of the legislature.

It is said we must educate the children of the people in the schools of the people, as though the children of the people, and those too from whom the people have most to hope, do not find as ready admission to the higher as the lower seminaries, if they wish to enter; as though the children of the people do not constitute the whole body of students in all our colleges and high schools. It is a most injurious assertion, let who will utter it, that the advantages of our higher institutions are specially designed to favor particular classes or particular professions, or that the sons of the rich and honored in the world, in this way derive exclusive benefits and privileges, as is the case in some of the European universities. This assertion, which we often hear in some quarters, is the offspring of unpardonable ignorance, or else it is born of sheer malignity. So far is it from the truth, that our high schools and colleges tend to create or foster such distinctions, that a large proportion of the students in our most thriving institutions, are the sons not of the affluent, but of the honest poor: many of them indeed boasting of a parentage belonging to nature's nobility, though unknown to fame. And if there can be found on earth a realization of that dream of politicians, a republic where there is a perfect equality of rights and privileges, and a perfect reciprocity of social sympathy and good fellowship, absolutely independent of the facili-

tous distinctions which prevail elsewhere, that realization is a community of students in an American college.

The patriotic motive is appealed to with the greatest success in the cause of common schools; for the benefits of the primary schools are brought in a direct and tangible form to every man's door. But because the advantages received by the community from the higher seminaries, are less easy to be apprehended by the popular mind, it does not follow on that account, that they are less real or less essential to the true happiness and glory of the state.

That the public safety requires that all the youth of the land shall be instructed in the rudiments of knowledge, is received as an axiom. Indeed it is strongly recommended by high public functionaries in the state of Massachusetts, to employ compulsory measures to force by fines and penalties the attendance of the children at the public schools. Whatever may be said of the expediency of such measures, the end aimed at is most important. But it is equally essential to the well being of the entire community of the very same persons benefitted by the primary school, that the seminaries shall be most efficiently sustained, which are to train up the public servants and teachers of the people.

The impression is quite too common, that the advantages of a liberal education are rather individual than general, personal rather than popular. It is to be feared that even those who have enjoyed the advantages of the higher institutions, think too little of their universal relations, and too frequently embrace the popular error, that when young men resort to the academy and the college to benefit themselves, whatsoever is thus contributed to the glory of the state, is to be regarded as an incidental good, and not as a leading aim of the higher seminaries.

What is the ultimate design of

the higher institutions of learning, and what are their relations to the state? The student may properly look at objects to be gained, which to him are purely personal. The parent and guardian will also be deeply interested in the same individual ends. But the teacher, the philanthropist, the statesman, will take their observations from a different stand-point. And both pupil and teacher, the natural guardians of the young and the public guardians of the state, will when the end of the college course of study and discipline has been reached, find that the greatest good of the individual coincides with that of the commonwealth. It is right that the student should regard as an end, whatever tends to fit him for future service in the active professions. Let him explore the rich treasures of science. Let him become familiar with the best models of taste and style, in eloquence and in composition. Let him so far as possible be imbued with the true spirit of classic art, and learn to appreciate the inimitable conceptions and the immortal forms of classic beauty. And that he may be urged as much as possible to intellectual effort, let him be affected by the incentives of a generous ambition, which operate so powerfully and incessantly on college ground. These motives and methods of discipline, the *ratio conformatioque doctrinae* of Cicero, must result in personal advantages to the student of the greatest value. The power of efficient thought, the facility of appropriate expression is acquired. The mind is liberalized, in the sense of refining the taste by subjecting it to that high standard of criticism which is formed, not from the fancies of the passing times, nor from the bold and striking conceits of some wayward though leading mind, but from a standard of criticism, which is the resultant of the studies and mental training of successive generations of the best teach-

ers and the best scholars on the same ground. The mind also, in this way, becomes liberalized, in the sense of being set free from the dominion of wrong biases, from unfounded prejudices, from all the unreal phantoms, the *idols*, as Lord Bacon calls them, which forever beset uneducated or partially educated minds, and hold so many in hopeless bondage. There is also a benefit of incalculable advantage to the general interests of society, arising from the cultivation of the liberal arts, whereby the boundaries of knowledge are enlarged, and discoveries are made of the greatest utility.

But important as these benefits are to the student, when regarded as personal ends, yet by the university itself, and the state in which it exists, these ends become the means to an object greater than all, viz., the true glory of the state and the progress of the immortal kingdom of God in the hearts of men. There is a higher interest connected with the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, than the tuition in the various departments of useful learning, received by the students during the period of their residence at college. England has a motive greater than that of conferring upon mankind those general benefits, which we and all who speak the English tongue enjoy, from having in enduring literature the works of her master minds, educated in those time-honored institutions. That great end to which we refer, is vital to the very existence of the British empire. It pertains to that which perpetuates the national life. It is that which tends to reproduce in the successive generations of the British race, those high characteristics and sentiments, that have made illustrious the British name. It is not in the halls of Westminster, nor at Windsor Castle, nor in the royal cabinets and armories of Tower Hill, but in the ancient universities, that the great heart of England beats. There in those

seats of learning, where are gathered the memories of her long line of illustrious scholars and statesmen—there where the proudest associations of national honor, are deepest felt by susceptible and generous minds—there where are kept the records of the national renown from the days of King Alfred, the sons of the nobility and gentlemen of England come to be educated. And because of the influences thus formed and the sentiments there inspired, there are produced elements of national strength and vitality of such importance, that Great Britain could better afford to lose all her military defenses, and every ship of that navy which has given her the dominion of the sea.

We hardly need here remark, what "forces of strength" would accrue to these resources of national energy, if the tests were abolished which exclude dissenters from the English universities. In return for the privileges, which such men as Archbishop Whateley, the late Dr. Arnold and others, have wished to be extended by the government to the non-Episcopal population, the state would receive a tribute of increased patriotic regard, richer far than the income derived from all foreign dependencies.

Now have we the same element of strength, in the constitution of American society, which has been and will continue to be productive of general advantages, similar in kind to those received by England from her universities? We answer, yes; a system far better adapted to our need—a system equally efficient for good, and vitally connected with all the great interests entrusted to the guardianship of the state.

Our higher seminaries were not founded to educate the sons of a legally recognized nobility, for none such have ever inhabited our soil; nor even to educate the sons of gentlemen, in the old English sense of the word gentleman, for of that class

few ever emigrated to New England; since a gentleman, according to the old English notion, was "one whose rank made it unbecoming and degrading for him to labor, and whose estate rendered labor unnecessary." But it was that the great body of the people might be ennobled by the possession, or by the influence of enlightened minds, that they might thus be raised to the dignity of gentlemen, in the better and modern sense of the term, "which embraces all the admirable and high moral traits of manhood." It was that labor might be redeemed from degradation, and the constitution of God vindicated, who wisely ordained the destiny of labor as one of happiness and honor. From the earliest times, these great objects have been appreciated no where with more clearness, than in our higher seminaries of learning, and no instrumentality has been more efficient in promoting them. It was the training of the young men in the colleges of New England, and their influence in the community, that kept alive and caused to take deep root the germs of popular liberty, planted by the fathers, and which slowly and surely developing, were one day to ripen into fixed sentiments and written constitutions. The early teachers of New England did much to form a style of manners and modes of thought that should be American and not European. They did much to weaken the sentiment of foreign vassalage, and kindle a national spirit. They did much to imbue the popular mind, not so much with a feeling of loyalty for the king, as with a feeling of reverence for the authority of their own commonwealths; and especially did they exert a commanding influence to enthrone the altars of God, not under Gothic arches, in temples consecrated after the manner of the Jewish or Papal ritual, but deep in the hearts of an intelligent and Christian people.

While we claim so much for the higher seminaries, as having exerted so important an influence in giving form and character to the institutions under which we now live, we do not forget that these most happy results could not have been accomplished without the constant coöperation of the primary schools. We believe that the agency of the higher schools on the leading minds of the community was greater in former days than at present, but at no period has any department of the system worked independently or otherwise than in entire harmony with the others. And in this respect there is a striking contrast between the workings of the American system of education and that of any foreign land.

For there is no intimate relation between the ancient public schools of England and the comparatively recent measures to educate in some degree the peasantry and operatives of the larger towns. The British empire attained to its present degree of influence among the nations by other means than by promoting popular education. It was enough that the sons of the nobility and gentry were educated in the best possible manner. The same will hold true in other countries where still more has been done and excellent schools exist for the benefit of the lower classes. But these model primary schools, as some are disposed to regard them, have no necessary connection with the gymnasium or the university. The normal system of state schools in Prussia, which has been conducted with such consummate ability and success, has specific purposes to accomplish which would meet with no sympathy with the public sentiment in this country. We know not what may be the result of the great popular revolutions now in progress. One effect may be to modify essentially the ends of popular instruction which have hitherto prevailed.

Some idea may be formed of the system from the recent work of Chevalier Bunsen on the "Constitution of the Church of the Future."

This author, lately one of the ministers of William Frederick and enjoying a high reputation throughout Europe, tells us that the seventeen thousand schoolmasters of Protestant Prussia are trained in the following manner for their profession.—After having been thoroughly educated until their fifteenth or sixteenth year in the higher schools where Latin and Greek are taught, they are then trained from two to three years in one of the twenty-four Protestant seminaries for the education of schoolmasters. They are then considered as connected with the ecclesiastical establishment of the kingdom, and hold their place of teacher as a national office; each teacher, to use the exact language of Chevalier Bunsen, "holding a genuine churchmanly and national profession, being connected with the pastor of the parish in religious instruction, and sometimes in cases of necessity acting as his deputy in the performance of divine service, as far as this consists in preaching; the schoolmaster in Prussia being in fact the minister's deacon for the instruction of the rising generation. Here, then, we have, as it appears, a very substantial living branch of the real Diaconate in the apostolic sense, that is, of the system of helpers or assistants in the church."

Such is the design of the normal school system of Prussia as developed by one of the court ministry, who speaks of it in terms of the highest praise. He calls it "an admirable system, having grown up in the church under the dictatorship of the state, and that in heavy and sorrowful times both for government and people, that is, from 1807 to 1815."

Much has of late been said in favor of normal schools, and in several of the New England states

such institutions have been established. They are named after the Prussian model, and their general design is to train teachers for the primary schools. We conceive they can hardly resemble the Prussian normal schools in any other particulars, inasmuch as in order to be successful they must coincide in the main with the general features of the grammar school or academy, one great design of which has ever been to furnish teachers for the primary schools.

If indeed the whole system of American popular education is to be reconstructed, and the common school is to be separated from its ancient and natural alliance with the grammar school and college, and henceforth to claim popular sympathy as having popular aims, while the higher seminaries are to be left to the sympathies of their alumni as having other than popular aims, then indeed must there be a great deficiency in the proper means of common school instruction. But if there is to be, as formerly, a common aim and sympathy, then let it be regarded in time to come, as it ever has been, one of the legitimate purposes of the higher seminaries, of every grade, to provide suitable teachers for every grade of the lower. And if the business of teaching is to rank in usefulness with the so-called learned professions, let the present normal schools of New England be supplied with the most accomplished teachers, and let them be the resort not of those only who have completed the studies of the common school and the academy, but let the graduate of college also resort there, so that in this profession as well as in others, all questions relating to the true philosophy of education, as well as the best methods of imparting instruction, may be examined by mature and disciplined minds. But when all is done that can be done for the elevation of the common

school, (and the work of improvement is yet in its early stages of progress,) still we most earnestly protest against the assumption, that the common school in its most perfect state, will render the higher schools less important. There will then be a greater demand than ever for their controlling conservative influences. On this condition only is it possible that what is claimed for the common school, as a means of social elevation, as a safeguard of freedom, as the hope of coming ages, can be true. This *sine qua non* condition of their utility, we do not often hear mentioned in the projects of radical reformers and in the speeches of political demagogues, who seek for popular favor by promoting popular delusions. There is a light shining from the more abundant sources of knowledge and truth, from whose presence false pretenders in philosophy and time serving politicians find it agreeable for themselves to retire, and gladly would they keep others also from the light.

This absolute condition of the highest success of primary schools, is sometimes lost sight of by those whose zeal in their defense is worthy of all commendation. Some appear to forget all other agencies of doing good, in their exclusive regard for one class of instrumentalities, to advance the cause of virtue and human happiness. Hence in teachers' conventions, invidious comparisons are sometimes introduced as to the relative importance of the business of teaching and that of other professions. For our part, we would do honor to the faithful teacher in every grade and department of instruction. In New England the faithful, successful teacher has never failed to secure respect. And our belief is, that the *commune vinculum* which unites the aims and sympathies of all the learned professions with that of teaching, will be kept bright and burnished. We

have always admired the liberal spirit of Sir Thomas Browne, the author of the *Religio Medici*, in his remark, that "all the liberal professions have their origin in a common design to remedy the woes occasioned to the human race by Adam's fall." Some appear to have a different opinion, and we have witnessed amusing devices to raise what is called the "dignity of the teacher's profession," from what is thought to be a position much too low in the public mind. If such a state of things exists proper remedies should be sought. We have no great objection if teachers' conventions and associations pass resolutions of self-commendation, though this process of acquiring "due dignity," reminds us of the experiment sometimes made by boys, untaught in the natural laws of action and reaction, who try to elevate themselves to a more conspicuous position by means of their boot straps. Still we are inclined to think this method to win popular consideration, will not generally diminish the amount or the utility of the services of teachers, nor lessen the public appreciation of them.

When however unfavorable comparisons are introduced into popular assemblies, and common school teachers and those who are specially devoted to the cause of common school education, resort to the very old method of self-exaltation, that of pulling others down, they will do a greater injury to the higher institutions and eventually to themselves, from the fact, that their great services to the public being known and felt by all men, must give them an advantage in such a strife over those who are endeavoring to defend popular interests no less vital, though not so readily seen and estimated by the people according to their worth. And therefore it is that the friends of the higher institutions should earnestly protest against all such unwarrantable assumptions, and resist all popular tendencies

calculated to diminish their popular influence. Let them speak freely not arrogantly, but without fear, not as those "having authority," nor yet by dictation or permission "as the scribes."

But give us *self-made* men, it is said — Washington and Franklin never studied Greek or Latin, and some of the greatest men of this free country graduated at the common school — just as though there was a real foundation for the designation we often hear of a *self-made* class in the community, as though any man in such a country as ours could possibly arrive at an eminence truly respectable and honorable by any means in college or out, in an honest calling, except by efforts purely and personally his own — as though all young men who do not study what Washington and Franklin did not study, will therefore become Washingtons and Franklins.

If there is one popular error more detrimental to the progress of learning in this country than any other, it is that which consists in not apprehending the true uses of classical studies as a means of education. We think the impression is quite general, that there is no particular relation existing between the means of mental discipline furnished in the higher schools and those in the lower — that, therefore, the college studies do not directly prepare a teacher the better for service in an English school — and of course, progress in improvement in the lower schools does not consist in an approximation towards the studies and modes of training pursued in the higher seminaries, at least so far as respects the study of the classics. It is not many years since it was a matter of serious discussion in some of the colleges, whether the classics should not be dispensed with as a part of a course of liberal education, and something more practical be substituted. The Faculty of Yale College thought it necessary to publish an

able defense of the ancient system. The question was soon decided, and it will not again be raised in any of the higher institutions, and we trust that in the exercise of their proper vocation they will, ere long, entirely correct the popular errors that prevail on this subject. The time is not distant, we trust, when that which is deemed essential, as a means of mental cultivation in college, will be regarded as equally useful, for all young persons who are desirous, as far as they can, to improve their minds by the best methods and the best studies. If the word *practical* means whatever is *useful*, and the word *useful*, in respect to school studies, means whatever affords discipline, information, refinement and pleasure to the mind, then is the study of the classics a proper means of education most practical and useful, for boys engaging in all sorts of professions and occupations, demanding mental discipline and cultivation. Classical studies are adapted to be elemental as well as complementary in a course of intellectual training. They are the best means to educate boys rapidly and thoroughly, while they are most admirable to instruct, refine and delight men.

"The study of language," says Dr. Arnold, "seems to me as if it was given for the very purpose of forming the human mind in youth; and the Greek and Latin languages, in themselves so perfect, and at the same time freed from the insuperable difficulty which must attend any attempt to teach boys philology through the medium of their mother tongue, seem the very instruments by which this is to be effected."

"The study of Latin and Greek is important, as a school exercise mainly because it enables us to understand and employ well that language in which we commonly think and speak and write. It does this because Greek and Latin are specimens at once highly perfect

and incapable of being understood without long and minute attention. The study of them, therefore, naturally involves that of the general principles of grammar; while their peculiar excellencies illustrate the points which render language clear and forcible and beautiful. But our *application* of this general knowledge must naturally be to our language; to show us what are its peculiarities, what its beauties, what its defects—to teach us by the patterns or analogies offered by other languages, how the effect which we admire in them may be produced with a somewhat different instrument. Every lesson in Latin or Greek may and ought to be made a lesson in English. The translation of every sentence is properly an exercise in extemporaneous English composition, a problem how to express, with equal brevity, clearness and force in our own language, the thought which the original author has so admirably expressed in his."

Such is the testimony of the teacher of Rugby, showing the connection there is between the study of the classics and that branch of study which forms so important a part of common school education. We mean English grammar, including composition, which is too generally neglected in the primary schools in this country. We do not think it would be wise for the pupils generally to study Latin in our common schools. The course of study in the primary schools should, in the main, be confined to the rudiments of an English education. Still the advantages of instruction in the classics should be enjoyed by as many of the youth of the land as possible. Such a course would be far preferable to that which is becoming fashionable, to devote very much of the time for the education of young men for agricultural and mercantile pursuits, to the study of elementary treatises on the natural sciences—most of which, as means of mental

discipline, are no better than a newspaper. It is deemed of the greatest importance that teachers of common schools shall be as well furnished as possible for their work, but how long will it be before the work of improvement will have advanced so far as that every teacher of a New England common school shall be required, not to teach, but to be himself taught in Latin and Greek, as an essential preliminary to engage in his profession, according to that excellent feature of the normal school system in Prussia, which has been so highly extolled, and which requires of every candidate for admission to the teachers' seminaries that he be instructed in Latin and Greek.

And yet the comparatively few classical teachers in this country are deprived of that popular sympathy which the masters of the English schools enjoy in full measure, because the mutual relations of the two departments of instruction are not seen, or because the utility of the classics is feebly or not at all apprehended. They are called upon to answer the questions, who are benefitted by your teachings, save as they may be useful as school drillings? and how can the writings of a remote age, in a language no longer spoken, stand related to the wants of the world in the living, active present? Let the teacher of Rugby reply, than whom no man of our times has lived with aims more intensely practical.

"The mind of the Greek and the Roman is, in all the essential points of its constitution, our own—and not only so, but it is our own mind developed to an extraordinary degree of perfection. Wide as is the difference between us with respect to those physical instruments which minister to our uses or our pleasures, though the Greeks and the Romans had no steam-engines, no printing presses, no mariner's compass, no telescopes,

no microscopes, no gunpowder, yet in our moral and political views, in those matters which must determine human character, there is a perfect resemblance in these respects—Aristotle and Plato and Cicero and Tacitus are most untruly called ancient writers—they are virtually our own countrymen and contemporaries, their conclusions bear on our own circumstances, their information has all the charm of novelty, and all the value of a mass of new and pertinent facts, illustrative of the great science of the nature of civilized man—they belong really to a modern civilization like our own; with a perfect abstraction from particular party names, which so much bias our judgment in modern and domestic instances, they discuss and illustrate the principles of all political questions, both civil and ecclesiastical, with entire freedom, with the most attractive eloquence, and with the profoundest wisdom."

There is one more mutual relation of the higher and lower seminaries of learning, to which we will but briefly allude, though in importance, it may exceed all others mentioned. We refer to the common interest they have in relation to correct principles of moral discipline. The modes of moral discipline may, by reason of circumstances, vary in different grades of schools, and even in different schools of the same grade. But there can be but one correct system of moral discipline, the same in all the circumstances of childhood or manhood. The authority of law must be respected, there must be a willing obedience to it, and when it is willfully broken the offender must suffer, so that, at all events, the law shall be honored, and, if possible, that he may be led to reformation. As childhood is the proper season to implant the principle of obedience and a relish for it to continue through the whole period of parental

authority, so is the moral discipline of the common school related intimately to that of the academy and the college, the general duty of obedience and sentiments of respect which pupils owe to their instructors being the same in all schools. Therefore it is a point of infinite concern to the prosperity of the higher seminaries and the safety of the students connected with them, that the right principles of discipline be taught and practiced in all the primary schools. And the relation of schools of learning of every grade, to the security and happiness of the state, is in respect to no one point, more momentous than in this.

In all our colleges and in most of the higher institutions, it is believed that moral discipline is still administered on correct principles. Public sentiment still requires the maintenance of strict discipline, and the enforcement of extreme penalties, to secure the success and safety of students surrounded by the dangers and temptations of college life.

But for the common school, we have heard of new and improved systems of discipline, and in these new systems, though such terms as "moral discipline," "moral influences," and "moral suasion" are introduced, yet the word "moral" has such a meaning as gives it no right to be associated in any way with the idea of discipline.

It is said we must govern by the *authority of love*. The phrase *authority of law* sounds harsh and ungentle, and affects the nerves of those who are meekly perverse and good naturally obstinate, and amiably criminal. The teacher must rule by the law of love and all will be well; he will ever find a ready response to all his wishes.

Now that teacher fulfills to his pupils the law of love, who teaches them to love the law and to reverence its sanctions, and who seeks to implant in them, if possible, an ever abiding

regard for the rule of right conduct, a regard fortified by the motive of fear, yea, of exceeding dread of the consequences of wrong doing. And to ensure the habit of moral obedience, the teacher of right may, and in duty must, employ adequate means.

What is there in the idea of an unbending law of right that should be repulsive to young minds, that should be withheld, that should be softened down by smooth names? What child is too young to learn the most important lesson of sympathy, with the spirit of what is described in the celebrated words of Hooker, that "of law, no less can be said, than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world."

We can not but think the discussions that have prevailed, in reference to the use of corporal punishment, have been uncalled for, and have been demoralizing in their tendency. There may be occasionally instances of severity in its use, but then there are means of redress and remedy, other than calling in question principles on which all authority rests. The exercise of the master's right in the primary school to inflict pain as the extreme penalty of school discipline, must, under judicious and sensible management, but very seldom occur, and then indeed, however painful it may be to the master, the moral uses of it are such as to render it his imperative duty to employ it. The calling in question his right to use this mode of discipline, must tend greatly to increase rather than lessen the occasions of administering it.

That theory of school government which is not safe to announce from the teacher's desk, is not safe to announce any where. That system which would naturally find sympathy with boys, inclined to be idle and vicious, should never be heard of by them. That good time, dreamed of by radical reformers, is never coming, when juvenile de-

linquents or adult criminals will be less inclined to wrong doing by the advocacy of such a theory of moral discipline. That good time is never coming when indolence will be quickened and passion checked, or the power of temptation be weakened by such a notion. That good time is never coming until human nature shall no more need moral discipline, being "fixed in virtue, though free to fall."

The cause of the discussion is not, we are persuaded, that there has been any general abuse of power by the schoolmasters, but the principle is unpalatable on which the ancient theory of school discipline rests. The controversy is analogous in its causes and general bearings, to that which has arisen on the capital punishment question and some other topics of a political character. Retiring from places of public notoriety, such as the hall of legislation and the pulpit, and avoiding controversy with the leading minds who are busily engaged in the engrossing duties of professional life, the advocates of error have entered the school room, and under the covert of a most zealous regard for universal education, have they set themselves to revolutionize public sentiment by infusing false notions into the minds of the young, as to the principles of obedience to the authority of law, and thus will the safety of the state ere long be greatly endangered by a generation of active citizens who will have been in the habit of regarding, not the law of conscience, but mere inclination as the right principle of action.

If these wrong notions of school discipline shall prevail in the common schools, their influence will soon extend to the higher institutions and increase a thousand fold the difficulties of maintaining sound discipline in our colleges and universities. And no conservative power of any or all of our seminaries of

learning, will be able to prevent the destruction of public morality and the introduction of the worst principles of civil government.

Therefore this heresy in the matter of school discipline should be watched with a most wakeful solicitude by the patriot and the Christian. It is the offspring of a false philosophy of social life, though loud in its pretensions of reform. It is a philosophy which calls crime a misfortune or a disease, and retributive justice it calls revenge. It is the offspring of a false philanthropy, though loud in its professions of benevolence. It is a philanthropy which sheds crocodile's tears over the merited sufferings of the guilty criminal, but has no sympathy for outraged justice; and thus have the forms of law been made to shield the greatest crimes, and penitentiaries have become retreats for the insane or cities of refuge from the avenger of blood.

We shall not endeavor here to refute these monstrous errors farther than to say, that if the principle of punishment be not legitimate which makes the criminal a sufferer, and those ends of punishment can not be justified which are retributive, then we know not what to think of the universal sentiment of mankind, which has awarded the highest honors to such names as that of Aristides the Just; of the elder Cato, the stern old Roman Censor, "who had rather his good actions should go unrewarded than his bad ones unpunished;" of Sir Thomas More, who could most cheerfully die rather than compromise his integrity; and of our own Marshall, whose love of truth and justice was a burning passion. How shall teachers in our schools commend, as they do, these examples to the admiration of their pupils, and yet exercise over them a system of discipline which tends to the subversion of that idea of truth and justice, the love and the practice of which made these great names immortal?

## PRINCIPLES IN THE ART OF LANDSCAPE.

THE art of landscape\* is wholly a modern art. It is but recently, indeed, that it could with any plausibility prefer a claim to a place among the arts; as it is but recently that any serious attempt has been made to reduce it to any artistic principles.

It is more than any other of the fine arts, perhaps, an art of peace. Only where civil quietness and security, and consequent domestic enjoyment, reign in a high degree, can it well be cultivated. The warlike Greek, while he carried other arts of design to the highest perfection, never dreamed of expressing "immortal sentiments and divine ideas" in landscape; for the sentiments and ideas most appropriate to such expression, were in a great measure by his social habits and condition driven from his bosom. He could chisel sentiments of courage and heroic endurance in forms of matchless beauty, for they were sentiments which his condition was every way fitted to develop and strengthen; and such products of his constructive genius were not so liable to perish in an age of incessant strife and war. The sculptor found in the solid and enduring marble, the fittest material in which both to embody the commanding ideas of his age—an age of martial heroism, and also safely to enshrine the workings of that anticipating genius which can find in nothing short of immortality its end and satisfaction. The reigning ideas of such an age naturally delighted, too, for

the same reason, in the massive stateliness, the solidity and firmness of architectural forms.

Hence in the two departments of sculpture and architecture, Grecian art particularly developed and perfected itself.

How uncongenial both with the material and the sentiments proper to the art of landscape, was such an age and such ideas. This art is the expression more of domestic seclusion and tranquillity,—of the mild, the gentle, the yielding graces. It implies a state of civil and social security and confidence. Strong-walled towns thronged with a population seeking protection and defense on the one hand, and waste, deserted fields on the other; states condensed into cities, and cities the common and fit designations of states; aggressive warfare for its own sake, the prime element and characteristic feature of all state-polity and all state-policy; society in its inmost structure clannish, if not Ishmaelite, and in its actual outworkings marauding, pillaging, wasting, even the humble art of agriculture hardly reached in growth the measure of mere necessary wants, and a well-tilled, well-stocked field was regarded as a rare and admirable achievement of energy and skill. The kitchen-garden of Alcinous, Homer paints with a poet's enthusiasm, as if a prodigy of art; and in later times, Plutarch gives us but a sorry view of the development of taste in this direction, when he tells us the common practice in ornamental gardens was, to set off the beauties of roses and violets by intermingled leeks and onions.

Roman life, at certain periods of its history, admitted more readily the culture of the art. But those periods were periods of luxury and prodigality; and Roman gardens

\* We think it time to drop a part of the cumbersome expression, landscape-gardening, and designate the art henceforth directly from the material on which it is employed. Justified as the designation is, by abundant philological analogies, use will soon wear off whatever of harshness or strangeness may appear at first in the expression.

were rather exhibitions of lavish profusion in proprietors, than of true taste in artists. Mechanical skill was not undervalued; but it rose no higher than bare imitation. The highest name that the Romans could give an artist in landscape, was one that designated mere skill in training and paring vegetable growths into curious shapes. The *topiarius* was first and chief in the art; and his most admired works were monsters sheared out in the spray of shrubbery and trees. Elevated and pure as was their taste for natural scenery, and rich and glowing as are the descriptions given of it by their poets, yet the Romans seem never to have conceived of the possibility of true garden and field decoration.

Among the ancients, the art of landscape rose hardly to the first stage of development. It did not gain admittance even into their conceptions as an art by itself.

During the barbarous ages that succeeded the decline of Roman civilization, when every existing art perished, it was not to be expected that a new art, much less an art emphatically of peace, should arise. While the soil was tilled, and lords and bishops decorated to some extent their palaces and their courts, still no proper art of landscape had existence. Indeed the very name of the art has a significant historic import. While other arts have derived their names as their origin from classic times, this art proclaims its recent nativity in the name it has taken from our own expressive vernacular.

We are to date the birth of the art, in its proper sense, down as late as the sixteenth century. Since that time it has been cultivated at periods with great ardor and success. In its progress, like other arts, it has had its schools—its specific phases and characteristics, determined to it by the character of the age or people by which it has been cultivated. It will not be irrelevant to our ob-

ject to enumerate and describe in brief terms, the several prominent stages by which the progress of the art has been characterized. It will be seen at once from the description, that these stages naturally succeed each other;—that not only was the order in which they successively appeared such as was to have been anticipated beforehand, but that each subsequent phase of the art was induced and determined by the preceding. These several stages are—

The French or Geometric;

The Chinese or Pseudo-natural;

The modern English or Picturesque; to which we may add as the last and highest, but yet to be realized—

The Expressive or True Artistic.

The French or Geometric is the first in order of nature, as it was first to appear in time. Even the Romans, here and there, seem almost to have attained this stage. Regularity, straight lines, plane angles, proportion, are the first, most unequivocal deviations from irregular nature. Nothing so decisively indicates that reason, more or less perfect, has been at work, than a straight line. It tells us at once that rude nature has been met and overcome; and as art pleases us ever, even rude art, as compared only with wild, unreduced nature, rectilinear streets and walks give naturally a pleasing effect. If a higher culture of the taste experiences no such pleasure, but even disgust at the square and compass landscape, it is only because it compares it with a higher, more truly artistic method. The less cultivated taste is satisfied; for it has no conception of a higher form of the art. And the first awakenings of the aesthetic spirit should not be frowned upon because not mature and perfect. If the straight-lined sculpture of Egypt is despicable by the side of the free Grecian art, it is not so by the side of utter barbarism. If it was much to rise from the stiff

Egyptian to the graceful Grecian, it was more to wake up art from the dead sleep of barbarism, and give it real although immature life.

Illustrations of the geometric style of landscape, are found every where in the first awakenings of taste. The traveler in France meets it at every turn. In city and in country alike, in garden and park, orchard and forest, we find nothing but straight lines. The magnificent entrance into the city of Paris, and its copy, the entrance into Milan in Lombardy—the bold conception and work of Napoleon—fill every mind with admiration. Here true artistic propriety demands the rectilinear style; and hence the highest and truest taste is satisfied. In Great Britain, also, are to be found not unfrequent specimens of this style;—the remains, perhaps, of French influence on the English mind in past ages. It would have been well if it had reached, also, some of the high roads whose serpentine course now awakens in the hastening traveler other emotions than those of æsthetic pleasure. In our own country we find it every where in place and out of place. It is not seldom in place; for, as already intimated, the geometric style of landscape is sometimes required by true principles of taste. Order, regularity, system, are the first principles of city life; and these are expressed properly and naturally in rectilinear forms. Many of our towns are thus appropriately and beautifully laid out and decorated. But we find this style, also, in places altogether unmeet. An infantile taste, dissatisfied with the absence of all art, and yet incapable of rising to the true and perfect, reaches the first stage only, and is content. It has no conception of any higher, and of course does not seek it nor miss it. Hence every where, we find alike, yard and garden, cemetery and common, all laid off by rod and chain. Fences, trees, shrubs, walks, all *range*; and poor,

passive nature, who had done her best to mold her features into smiles of ease and grace, is scraped and shorn and sliced under the hard rule of level and plummet, till she literally gives up the ghost—is reduced to mere unexpressive matter. Art has triumphed over nature, indeed; but in so doing has destroyed itself. Instead of living, expressive art, it has become spiritless artifice. Free invention, the true soul of art, has given place to mere mathematical formulas; and ingenious execution has become mere mechanical skill, the drudge of models and numbers.

It was not to be expected that the free spirit of man would rest satisfied with this utter annihilation of natural expressiveness and beauty, in an endeavor only to make it more perfect. It is not, perhaps, surprising that in its effort to correct itself, so obviously in the wrong, it should fall back on the opposite extreme. Indeed, the *Chinese* or *Pseudo-natural* style was rationally to be expected as the second stage in the progress and development of the art. The mechanical stiffness of the rectilinear style, so utterly opposed both to the character of the material of the art—living nature,—and also to the character of the sentiments for the most part to be expressed by it, naturally drove men in their dissatisfaction with it, to the closest imitation possible of irregular nature. The compass and the chain were now rejected. Everything was to be done as it should happen, just as it was supposed to take place in nature. At least, nature was to be imitated as exactly as possible; and the standard of perfection in the art was the utter concealment of all art. The Chinese carried out the principles of this style to the farthest extent and most consistently. The landscape, under the hands of the artist, was to be a perfect miniature of the natural world. There were to be rivers

and lakes and grottoes and valleys and mountains and precipices and cascades—in short, every thing that is found in nature. As in nature, there are contrasts, so in the park and garden, there must be jagged cliffs hanging over luxuriant flower-gardens; gentle rivulets suddenly changing into mountain torrents; retired groves permeated by navigable canals; broad rivers disappearing in the earth; the wildest desolation succeeded by the highest cultivation. While nothing was to be introduced that might not be found in the natural world, nothing that was to be found there was out of place in the landscape. Hence old, dilapidated mills were put upon the streams; lightning-struck and half consumed buildings were thrown in here and there; dead trees were transplanted, and decayed logs dragged in, and all to be more true to nature.

There was much that was plausible in this view of the art of landscape. It shunned the repugnant features of the mechanical or geometrical school. It admitted of a show of art in the lower sense—of the indication of human ingenuity and skill. Indeed, the landscape created by these principles, evinced often admirable accuracy of observation and finish of execution. It was, however, only the geometrical eye of the practical engineer that measures accurately distances and angles, and the skill of the mere mechanic that works by models.

The principles of this style, moreover, were easily applied. There was no need of plan or study of effect. The whole work was to proceed hap-hazard—precisely after the supposed course of nature. Seeds of future shrubs and trees were to be dropped just where it was most convenient at the time to dispose of them. Enclosures could be made anywhere and in any shape. Groves, orchards, streams, every thing, were to be disposed as the merest chance

should dictate. In fact, the extreme stupidity and indolence were pretty sure to succeed as well as the utmost study and labor.

The theory itself, too, sounded well. What better than to imitate nature—the great product of divine skill? How better can nature speak than in the way the God of nature has bidden her speak? Is not every style opposed to this, necessarily unnatural, and therefore irrational and absurd? Is it not the very design and end of landscape to express the loveliness and harmony which the natural world expresses; and how can this be done but by exactly imitating nature?

The reasoning, at least, has proved conclusive with many minds. In Great Britain, not merely among the unthinking and unpracticed, but both among the theorists and the practical artists, this style has found extensive advocacy and patronage. Even Kent, the parent of the modern English landscape, with all his high training as an artist, adopted it, with some modifications which his taste as a professional painter forced him unconsciously to introduce, in all his landscapes, and carried it out to the last of its principles. Even Kent was Chinese enough to set out dead trees to imitate nature. And Lord Kames dwells on the description of the style with unconcealed satisfaction. Some modern writers regard it as the true art of landscape, and seem to imagine that the only alternative of rejecting it is to embrace the repulsive stiffness of the French method.

The reasoning by which the theory is supported need not be severely investigated in order that its sophistry and fallaciousness should be discovered. It has precisely the plausibility and conclusiveness, and no more, of that of the musical dreamer who, setting out with the position that all harmony of sweet sounds is in nature, should hence conclude at once that the only true

way of producing it by man is to congregate all sound-uttering things in the natural world, and by force or persuasion put all together on one grand musical effort: and the effect of this Chinese art of landscape on a truly refined taste, is much the same that we might imagine the effect to be on a well-harmonized ear of such a burst and swell of utterance from all that is noise-making in the living and material universe.

The transition from this method to the picturesque or modern English was easy and natural. It was readily seen and felt that not all of nature was beautiful; at least that the grand and lovely of the great actual world could not be daguerreotyped into a garden. The idea of *expression* was now fully developed; and there was no danger of falling back upon the unexpressiveness of the rectilinear style. Nature was not to be utterly destroyed in landscape, nor yet servilely copied in her mere outward dress, and that by fragments and rents. The study of nature had discovered that she had a voice by which she could reach the heart, and that the way to feel the true force of her varied tones, was not to crowd all her utterances together, and thus turn what was sweet and harmonious by itself into an element of harsh discord; but to search out her most perfect individual harmonies, and transfer them where their effect could be freely experienced. Claude Lorraine and the two Possinos had shown how the harmonies of the natural world could be displayed on canvas;—not by exact, servile imitation of any one natural scene, but by combination of what was perfect and lovely as found feature by feature, in diverse scenes; and the art of landscape, now, for the first time, advancing into the field of true art, taking its measure and its rule from the canvas, demanded congruous combination, and required all to be subservient to harmonious effect.

In the geometric school, the landscape was conceived and planned from its outlines on paper as laid off by scale and dividers; in the Chinese, plans were all laid aside, and the landscape grew up in all the freedom and unconstraint of unconscious nature, or what amounted to the same, nature was the copy and the landscape was the miniature; now the landscape was conceived and planned, not from maps nor from the actual world, but from the imagined representation in color and in crayon. At first straight lines alone were to rule, then no lines at all, at least none imaginary or artificial, and now the lines of perspective, light and shade, and harmonious coloring. The guide and rule was simply harmonious effect. While the map-like precision, the stiffness and leanness of the rectilinear school, gave place to a picturesque richness and variety, the contrasts and surprises in which the Chinese delighted also gave way to that harmonious composition, which is a first and indispensable characteristic of true art.

This style may be denominated the *modern English*, to distinguish it from that which prevailed in Great Britain before the times of Knight and Price; or the *Picturesque*, as indicating the point from which the view of the art is taken, and from which it is judged. It is the style now generally recognized by the numerous writers on the art, and by most of the professed artists in landscape. One of the latest and best writers of this school, is Mr. Downing; whose works, every where characterized by a refined taste and sound judgment, have greatly contributed to the improvement of landscape in this country, and are every where justly esteemed of the highest authority. The following extracts from his leading work on this subject, exhibit in brief the conception of the art as now for the most part entertained here and

in Great Britain. "By landscape gardening we understand not only an imitation, in the grounds of a country residence, of the general forms of nature, but an *expressive, harmonious and refined imitation*." "Expression being the master-key to the heart in all landscapes, it follows that the highest imitative sphere of the art of landscape gardening, consists in arranging the materials so as to awaken emotions of grace, elegance or picturesqueness, joined with unity, harmony and variety, more distinct and forcible than are suggested by natural scenery."\* It will be remarked, that while Mr. Downing speaks of *expression*, and even of "*expression of sentiment*," as necessarily entering into his idea of landscape, yet the expression is only of *aesthetic sentiment* generally,—not of sentiments which as expressed become *aesthetic* ;—in other words, it is the expression of the graceful, elegant, or picturesque.

This stage of the art is, obviously, far in advance of the preceding. It brings it into the field of true art in the highest sense—of *aesthetic art*. But it is much to be questioned, whether the art has reached perfection here. Indeed, this view of landscape, like the preceding, exhibits rather a *style* of the art, than the *art* itself. It does not teach what the art is in its essential character,—what consequently it must ever be. It seems to admit in itself of different styles, of different schools. It in fact recognizes two different schools, *the graceful* and *the picturesque*, which are distinguished from each other, not from any principle given in the conception of the art, and of itself determining the number of schools, so to speak, but by the accidental circumstance that there is a graceful and also a picturesque harmony, as if these were the only forms of harmonious expression. It but lays the ground

and excites the hope of the erection of still another school of the art. It is but the proper forerunner and earnest of a higher phase,—that which we have called the *expressive or true artistic* ;—a phase of which we find abundant evidence that the most devoted and successful students of the art had obscure anticipations and preconceptions.

The exact advance made in this last stage, consists in this ;—that while the picturesque school regard the art as an art, in a certain sense, of expression, they regard it as expressive only in the sense of awaking certain emotions of beauty ; the expressive or true artistic regard it as expressive of certain *ideas* or *sentiments*, which when thus expressed, are by the contemplating mind apprehended with those emotions of beauty, as natural and necessary accompaniments and consequents. The picturesque school fixes the eye on the *aesthetic* feelings awakened by landscape ; the artistic, on the sentiments or ideas which, as expressed in landscape, naturally awaken those feelings. The one constitutes the art from its effect ; the other, from its power to produce it. The one inquires, consequently, whether such and such arrangements and embellishments consist with such and such emotions of taste ; the other, what precisely are those sentiments which expressed will necessarily produce those emotions. The guiding principles of the one are tentative in their character ; while in the other, they are rationally predeterminative and sure. The artist under the one proceeds gropingly, questioning at every step whether the effect is realized ; under the other he proceeds intelligently, knowing that if the materials and the arrangement which he has selected as suitable to the sentiment to be expressed, are actually adopted, the *aesthetic effect*,—the perfect satisfaction of a refined taste,—is certain.

\* Landscape Gardening, pp. 53, 54.

The distinction between the two conceptions of the art, may be illustrated from the art of sculpture. The merely picturesque sculptor takes his block of marble, and chips off here and there, till a form is at last reached which is aesthetic or tasteful. It may be a Jupiter or a Venus, an Apollo or a Pan. That with him is a merely incidental thing. What he has aimed at, is to develop a form of grace or a form of majesty; and he has chipped away till he has found it. The truly artistic sculptor first selects the sentiment or character which he is to express,—authority or tenderness, intellectual force or a chaste sensibility,—and then with this sentiment or character as the modeling image in his mind directing every blow, proceeds to chisel out a Jupiter or a Venus, an Apollo or a Diana, knowing that if the execution answer to the design, the product will be one of perfect taste, and satisfy every aesthetic sense.

This general sketch of the stages of the art of landscape, indicates at once the guiding principles in the practical application of it;—answers, in other words, the question, How am I, in my desire to arrange and invest my grounds in true taste, to proceed? I am not, obviously, to send for scale and dividers, and map out my grounds by mathematical lines, along which I am to place my fences, my walks, my shrubs and trees. I am not to send for a Chinese, and bid him go and survey the face of nature everywhere, and then come and stamp an exact image of it in daguerreotype miniature on my little piece of earth, taking especial care to imitate the strange, the incongruous, the grotesque, the monstrous. I am not to go to the painter, and bid him spread out for me on canvas a scene soft, quiet, graceful, or wild, bold and grand, although expressive of no particular sentiment, that I may copy it in landscape. I am not to grope my

way along in the dark, trying this experiment and that, and all in search of some general, indescribable effect of beauty. My work is all an intelligent, rational work,—a work of study and forecast, as is work in every art, but a work definite, simple, sure. I am to ascertain what sentiments or ideas are susceptible of being expressed in landscape, and under the limitations of my own individual resources and command of materials. I am, out of these sentiments and ideas, to select what particularly I will express. With the same block of marble, susceptible of being chiseled into the form of a Jupiter or an Apollo, I will not strive to express both and effect neither;—with the same grounds, endeavor to express the ideas and sentiments appropriate to a town-common and a retired villa, a nobleman's park and a peasant's door-yard. I will determine upon the specific character of sentiments and ideas which I will express; and will then from the study of my materials, the character, the extent, the shape and surface of my ground, the peculiarities of the shrubbery, trees, and other material of ground-investiture at my disposal, select and dispose so as to express precisely this character of ideas and sentiments. Proceeding thus, if that good Providence which has arranged all nature in forms of taste, and rudimentally disposed its various elements to assume shapes of beauty and loveliness, smile benignant on my work, I may rationally expect success; and in each revolving season, my own sense meanwhile excited, trained, and made more quick to beautiful impressions, may witness some new grace expanding, some new feature of loveliness unfolding, and all the diverse expressions of the varied scene harmonizing more and more into that unity of beauteous life, which shall perfectly satisfy my aesthetic sense.

But there are certain assumptions

in this general answer, which it may be necessary, in order to illustrate and establish its truth, to examine more particularly and distinctly.

It is assumed, in the first place, that it is possible to express certain ideas and rational sentiments in landscape;—to embody them in forms of vegetable life. This truth is, perhaps, sufficiently demonstrated by the analogies of all expressive art. The sculptor and the painter, certainly, have tested the capabilities of even inanimate matter to embrace ideas and to speak them forth in most moving utterances. The architect, also, who fills one department of the more comprehensive art of landscape, counts confidently on the susceptibility of rude matter to incorporate into itself, under the control of art, sentiments that thus expressed, shall be seen and felt; and in many a majestic temple, many a solemn cathedral, many a rustic cottage, he has spoken them forth in tones commanding on the heart. He has formed them forth, not by gropingly, tentatively aiming at a general pleasing effect; but by possessing himself firmly of the rational sentiments he is to express and then proceeding to express them under the laws of artistic invention and execution. Art can embody ideas then in the most rude and unimpressive matter.

But such sentiments are every where, in fact, expressed in living nature. There are scattered every where over the face of the earth, scenes of loveliness and grandeur. There is beauty in the still green vale; there is grandeur in the tall wide-branched oak; there is grace in the easy sweep of the bending willow: and it is lawful to go back of the effect and inquire why such objects and scenes are grand or lovely or graceful. We may feel the beauty and forget in our rapture to explain to ourselves the causes. We may feel it and be unable to follow up the emotion to its source,

as we believe much where we neither see nor can see evidence. Our powers are not acute enough or strong enough to penetrate the cause or ground. But we are, notwithstanding, authorized to attempt an answer to the question, and may, on a sufficiently large induction, justify its correctness. The rainbow is beautiful, because it utters, in its easy arch and its bright and delicately blended hues, sentiments of peace and purity. It is not poetry but the truest philosophy, that through it hears him who bent and painted it, speak thus to those of his creatures whom he has formed in his own image and has so formed precisely that he might thus speak to them holy, rapturous thoughts. It is, in like manner, the peace and security, sentiments most dear to the human heart, uttered in the secluded valley, the force and endurance expressed in the majestic oak, the freedom and exemption from all foreign constraint imaged in the sweeping willow, that awaken in us the emotions of beauty, grandeur and grace, which we feel when we contemplate these several objects. All beauty is thus but truth invested, embodied in material or intellectual forms. And so far from questioning whether rational sentiments can be expressed in material forms, we may rather question whether the divine architect of this whole physical universe, so constituted and ordained it for any other purpose than this—that it might be a fit medium of communicating thought and sentiment;—whether the highest, best, altogether the most rational view we can take of it, is not to regard it but as the book of God, in which, on every page, are recorded for man's inspection and study in intelligible, moving language, his Master's teachings.

It is implied further in the answer that has been given, that the creator of landscape may and must grasp the particular sentiment or senti-

ments to be expressed. Both the possibility and the necessity of this are implied, and may need vindication. It is not meant that scenes or objects really beautiful may not, by some rare possibility, be the effect of what we call mere accident. A man may shut his eyes, perhaps, and toss away his seeds, and a beautiful grove may spring up or a lovely bed of flowers. For nature does not work blindfold in carrying out blindfolded man's beginnings. But to proceed with rational hope of success, the sentiments to be expressed must be known beforehand.

This is possible to a sufficient extent at least. The individual sentiments and ideas, suitable to be expressed at all in aesthetic material forms, have not been fully enumerated and classed; nor have they been so distributed, in reference to the different departments of art, as to enable us at once to say what are the particular sentiments suitable for expression in landscape. But the classes of sentiments may be so described as to leave this part of his work open and plain to the artist.

The elements of beauty, or, in other words, our aesthetic ideas and sentiments, may be arranged into three classes. The first embraces those of a purely rational character, implying an aim and some kind of relationship. They are such specific ideas as those of unity, fitness, proportion, harmony and the like. Every aesthetic product, every landscape must have unity. This our rational nature requires; and all taste has its seat in the rational part of our being. It must have one end, and to this one end every thing must be subservient. If the architecture in a landscape furnish the leading and controlling element, then the selection and disposition of the trees and shrubbery must correspond. A cheerful cottage can not be at one with gloomy pines or haughty oaks; nor a majestic temple or stately halls with flower-beds

and light shrubbery. If the ground is to furnish the prevailing element, then the architecture must yield; and sculptured columns and carved vases must not be forced into the same scene with rugged cliffs and wild waterfalls; nor mossy arbors or thatched bowers be stuck in parterres of roses. Such combinations are but irrational jargon and confusion. They utter nothing; certainly nothing beautiful. So fitness, in the large comprehension of the term, embracing adaptedness to the design, the materials, the resources, the place, and proportion or just relationship, and harmony between the parts, all enter into every just conception of a piece of art. These several relations which may be embraced under the general term of *propriety*, the artist in landscape must, at the outset, have firmly apprehended. As ideas actually enthroned in his designing mind, they must preside over his entire work from beginning to end, and everywhere be expressed. They are the primary controlling elements or conditions of all beauty. As lying in our rational nature generally, and so existing, in a sense, prior to all proper aesthetic sentiments, they must ever control the latter and give law to them. They can never be violated or overleaped.

The second class of aesthetic elements embraces those which address themselves more directly to the emotive or affective part of our nature. They are designated in language by the sentiments themselves, as cheerfulness, tranquillity, dignity, and the like, or by the states or conditions which awaken them, as retirement, seclusion, authority, and the like. This class of elements differs essentially from the first. The first are rather negative conditions of all beauty; these are positive elements and constituents of beauty. The former enter into every product of true art, preside over its production, appear everywhere in it, can not be

set aside or disregarded ; the latter are not always necessary. There may be true beauty where only the rational elements, unity, fitness, proportion, combine with the elements that remain to be named, as constituting the third of our divisions. Where the rational elements alone appear, we have only useful arts, not elegant, according to the distinction that has been more commonly received. The introduction of one of the elements of this second class immediately elevates the product to the rank of the fine arts. But these sentiments can not, like the ideas of the first class, all combine in the same object. They are exclusive of each other. The sentiments of secluded cheerfulness and of tranquil security, the sentiments which domestic landscape should ever express, are incompatible with the solemn awe and dignity with which church-yard scenery should be invested. In the selection of the sentiments of this class, accordingly, begins the proper exercise of the discriminating taste of the creator of landscape. He is, from among them, to determine what shall consist with the great object of his work. As his art consists essentially in expression, he must, as a rational artist, determine what, specifically, he will express. Otherwise he must proceed, without intelligence, by hap-hazard guesswork, and his success must turn on the caprice of mere chance.

Public grounds should certainly express the sentiments appropriate to public life ; and these must vary specifically with the specific aspects of public life which present themselves in different scenes. The church has its associations ; and the sentiments of grandeur, dignity, authority, order, common to all the scenes of socially organized life, must here be specifically modified and characterized by the expression of the sentiments of solemnity, awe, reverence, purity and seclusion.

The market, the common, the mall, each has its circle of sentiments peculiar to itself ; while the halls of justice and of legislation demand in all the scenery which surrounds them, as well as in their own architectural plan and execution, the expression of those sentiments which such scenes of social life are fitted to inspire. Private life, too, has its class of sentiments which true taste will ever aim to impress on all the objects with which it is locally associated.

This diversity of sentiments, proper to appear in the various departments of landscape, no rational artist, no man of refined taste will overlook. And it need not be shown by more detailed illustration, with how much more intelligence and satisfaction and confidence, the work of disposing and embellishing grounds in whatever circumstances, in public or in private, will proceed, when the artist has, beforehand, determined the exact sentiment which he is to express, and has that firmly apprehended sentiment to guide him in every step of his progress.

The third department of elemental beauty is denominated by the comprehensive term, *grace*, and is founded in the free activity of our nature. This term, as applied to matters of taste, can not be more philosophically and accurately defined, than as "the expression of freedom." Whatever is properly denominated graceful, will ever be found to arise from free action, directly or remotely ; and every genuine expression of freedom is properly characterized as graceful.

Even in the physical world, every manifestation of grace images to the mind the idea of freedom unconstrained. The meandering rivulet is graceful while it seems to choose its own course and winds "by its own sweet will." It ceases to be graceful, when becoming the pitching, foaming torrent, its free

course is constrained and checked by foreign violence or obstruction. The bending willow sweeps gracefully because it seems to move unconstrained and in perfect freedom. The gambols of the frisking lamb, the curvetings of a frolicsome steed, are graceful because they betoken suppleness of joint, flexible muscle, in short, freedom from all constraint arising from outer force or inner weakness.

The same is true of all instances of the other department of grace—the *grace of repose*. The grace of repose differs from the grace of motion only in this—that it fixes the eye on the effect of free motion, while the latter turns the attention on the motion itself. It ever, consequently, implies motion, and, accordingly, ever suggests freedom. We awaken the sentiment of grace in repose, when we contemplate, for instance, the delicately turned features of supple infancy; and if we suffer our gaze to penetrate beyond the mere picturing surface to the actual substance imaged upon it, we shall find that it is the free motions of innocence, unperverted and undistorted, put forth in the yielding muscle of infancy.

All expressions of grace, thus, even in the physical world, are but images of freedom; and to the soul that has been trained in a true æsthetic culture, ever speak forth this high element of a rational nature. To such a soul the great artist reveals himself in all the forms of grace that the visible creation wears. With true unerring vision, as truly as the elevated spirit sees peace and purity imaged in the still, deep azure of the sky, or majesty in the shore-clasping ocean, such a soul discerns in all these forms of grace,

“The unambiguous footsteps of the God  
Who gives its luster to an insect’s wing,  
And wheels his throne upon the rolling  
worlds.”

All æsthetic grace reveals thus at once, a deity in nature, as it images

a moral element there which can only belong to a moral creator and disposer; and furnishes an incomparably higher evidence to every cultivated spirit of his being and his nature, than any arguments of fitness or of adaptation.

Grace, as thus the expression of the highest element of our nature, the peculiarly and strictly moral element, is the highest form of beauty. And the artist who would rise in his landscape to the most pleasing, most impressive exhibitions of beauty, must apprehend firmly this element and give it expression wherever it may find a place. It can not everywhere appear. Freedom must be controlled by rule and law; and grace must submit to the principles of propriety and fitness that rule with absolute sway all things rational. Architecture must have straight lines and angles. Streets and roads must minister to their proper end and design—convenience, and must be often direct; while grace rejects straight lines and angles, inasmuch as they imply constraint. Yet grace can find admission, at least to some extent;—particularly in private, domestic landscape, is it capable of entering in perfect conformity with all the rational elements to be expressed, of unity, fitness and proportion; and there, above all, should the great lesson of man’s moral nature everywhere be inscribed, that the image may be stamped by ever continued repetition on the forming spirit of unconscious childhood, and so ever in maturing life recall and foster the substantial truth itself.

The answer that has been given to the question, What are the guiding principles in the art of landscape, implies thus, that there are sentiments to be expressed which the artist may and must firmly apprehend, in order, confidently and intelligently, to prosecute his work.

This answer implies, moreover, that he, with equal firmness and in-

telectual clearness, apprehend the materials and the mode of arrangement, by means of which, and through which he is to express these sentiments. The assumption, therefore, of the possibility and the necessity of this firm apprehension remains to be vindicated.

Of the possibility, generally, of expressing aesthetic sentiments and ideas in the forms of vegetable life, enough has already been said. And to him who has schooled himself in nature, who has been wont to throw himself under the influence of the outer world, and to mark the diverse character of those influences as determined by diverse scenes and objects, little in addition need be said to show the possibility of expressing, in appropriate forms of vegetable life, the specific elements of landscape expression that have been enumerated. It is hardly poetry, or if poetry, it is poetic truth to say, that every vegetable structure and form, from the low creeping vine to the tall spreading oak, has its own expression; while the unlimited permutation of groups and combinations, both in kind and in place, shows a range and scope of diversified expression as unlimited. It would almost be a reflection on the divine artificer of the universe, to suppose for a moment that the objects of the vegetable world do not, in some sufficient degree, correspond in variety of character with the variety of sentiments, that in his constitution and investiture of nature, he has shown, may, and for man's benefit should be imaged in landscape.

The aesthetic student of nature has without difficulty learned the character of each form of vegetable life, and to him it has become an easy task to translate the peculiar expression of each into its proper aesthetic sentiment. The reverse act, to image forth the sentiment in tree and vine and shrub and flower, if more uncommon, or even more

difficult, is the more pleasing effort of a creative mind.

The expression of aesthetic elements by arrangement, requires a higher skill. Here forecast is necessary. Here is needed that high imaginative power, the most essential and most characteristic element of artistic genius—the power to construct proposed forms of beauty from materials, various, multiform, and rude. Out of the countless possible forms which diverse arrangements of given materials may furnish, he is to keep in his mind steadily his own ideal expression, and then pass before his view the successive possible groups and combinations till the desired antitype appear. Yet this is the common labor of every artist—

To arrest the fleeting images that fill  
The mirror of the mind and hold them fast,  
And force them sit, till he has penciled off  
A faithful likeness of the forms he views;  
Then to dispose his copies with such art  
That each may find its most propitious light,  
And shine by situation hardly less  
Than by the labor and the skill it cost.

It is to be borne in mind, moreover, that degrees in the richness of the expression are admissible, even when the same sentiment is imaged in the landscape. The coloring, so to speak, may be Rubens-like, deep and strong; or in the manner of Guido Reni, little more than bare light and shade. The composition may vary from the extreme simplicity to the most crowded denseness in almost every kind of landscape expression; and the artist may consult his own skill in the degree of richness he will impart to his work.

This department of his labor implies and requires aesthetic culture. He who knows nothing of the capability of expressing sentiment residing in the vegetable world, who has never felt the power of scenery grave or gay, on his own heart, or when impressed has never followed out the effect to its producing cause, may well decline the work of adapt-

ing-grounds to aesthetic expression. But he who would labor intelligently and with confidence must certainly know beforehand, what materials and what arrangement will best express the character of beauty he desires.

The exposition that has been given of the guiding principles of practical landscape, will, it is hoped, suffice to show that this is a true art in the highest sense; that, if we adopt the principle in the broadest import, "To spirit, can only spirit speak; only where an idea shines forth do we recognize true art,"\* landscape is yet not excluded. The very soul of landscape is the expression of a rational sentiment or idea.

It is an art that may be cultivated by all. The rudest peasant, as he may feel the power of beautiful and graceful form in landscape, is so far endowed with the power of creating it; while, from the very nature of the art, its power may be exerted in beautifying the scanty garden-plot as well as in embellishing and enriching the most extended park or field.

It is an art, like every other, requiring study and labor. A half hour's effort with rule and measure will not suffice to create expressive landscape. Nor will the want of all care or thought, save only to abun the stiffness of geometrical lines, of course secure the expression of real beauty, such even as is sometimes found in nature unadorned by art. Mere irregularity is not natural beauty. There may be beauty in the individual tree or shrub, while there is no beauty of arrangement or combination—the essential thing in landscape expression. "Elegance," to quote still again the garden-poet of our literature,

"Elegance, chief grace the garden shows  
And most attractive, is the fair result  
Of thought—the creature of a polished mind."

It is an art, moreover, that loves the light. The groping, tentative, it scorns. Its work is in intelligence throughout. From beginning to end the true artist proceeds in distinct apprehension of his object and his way. He errs not, therefore, and his result is sure.

It is an art, still further, self-sufficient and independent. Architecture it indeed embraces as a part of its own province. But the recourse, so often made, to eke out its imagined poverty and leanness, to the products of the chisel and the pencil, wrongs the art; and the wrong is generally resented. In the language of the elegant Herder, "where this beautiful art beautifies a land, no statues are needed on the way. In full *life* there meet us with their gifts, Pomona, Ceres, Pales, Vertumnus, Sylvanus, Flora." Where we have the living original, inanimate copies are out of place. In the manifold forms and products of vegetable life, is supplied to the ingenious artist all the materials which the fullest and richest expression can require. Under the mild sun of Italy, arches and vases and statues may possibly be introduced into the villa, as in harmony with the general landscape effect. But even there the admiring traveler, after passing out of the rich galleries of proper in-door art—of statuary and painting, feels no disposition to stop and study the sculptured forms which line his path to the true and pure landscape. And when he gives up his spirit to the full power of majestic forest and flower-enameled lawn, or winding stream, and sloping hill-side, various yet harmonious, natural, yet breathing rational sentiment, he gladly overlooks and drops from view the coarse, storm-pelted statuary which a prodigal, not a refined, art has scattered here and there. In ruder climes, the bolder, sterner forms of architecture alone can be admitted; and these only as propri-

\* Ficker.

ety, fitness to end, shall evidently require.

It is an art, moreover, of the highest moral value. All true art, indeed, embodies a moral sentiment or idea. The inner life and spirit in every true aesthetic work, in every true aesthetic object or scene, is this moral idea which inhabits and animates it. But landscape is of all arts the most expressive of moral truth. Even the unthinking child feels its elevating, grace-inspiring influence. The unfolding spirit under the constant power of expressive landscape, will mould itself into the forms of beauty and grace which are ever impressed upon it. Abstract rule, cold precept, arbitrary authority, necessary as they are, will yet yield, in power to form to virtuous sentiment, to the force of winning, subduing landscape, ever teaching, yet never obtruding, never irritating, drawing, not driving to the love and practice of what is pure and graceful and lovely. That "Heaven be near us in our infancy," need not be a poet's dream. It should be a common reality. In the sense of whatever is pure and lovely, it may be planted around every dwelling; may smile around every rustic cottage as on every wide-spread park and lawn. No more effective moral teacher can be conceived. Happy for our land if all over its wide extent, fast as its swelling population dot it over with dwelling and shop, with hall and

temple, and mark it off in yard and orchard and cultivated field and pasture, the spirit of taste might breathe, and, as in the nature of the case is possible, shape each architectural and rural labor into bright forms of loveliness and grace that everywhere should woo to virtue. In crowded city and in sequestered country life, in the scant yard of the humble peasant and on the wide domains of wealth and fortune, in the rude hut and the princely palace, everywhere, the art of landscape may work with all its pleasing, elevating power.

Happy, indeed, for our country, if what kind heaven has placed within our power, if what kind heaven has seemed to devolve upon us as our great mission-work and destiny, neglecting and suffering to die the rude arts of violence and war, our hands and hearts were turned to the great art of peace—the tasteful culture and investiture of our wide extended soil, seeking ever not merely to derive from fruitful nature bare satisfaction of animal wants—mere shelter and food for the body, the low aim to which necessity seems to have bound down the people of other lands, but also, with this, to convert nature into a minister to the spirit's wants, spread over its expanded face images of what is true and sacred, and make earth itself thus an ever present picture of heaven.

---

#### MEMOIR OF MRS. MARY E. VAN LENNEP.\*

AN eminent painter once said to us, that he always disliked to at-

tempt the portrait of a woman; it was so difficult to give to such a picture the requisite boldness of feature and distinctness of individual expression, without impairing its feminine character. If this be true in the delineation of the outer and material form, how much more true

\* *Memoir of Mrs. Mary E. Van Lennep, only daughter of the Rev. Joel Hawes, D.D., and wife of the Rev. Henry J. Van Lennep, Missionary in Turkey. By her Mother. Hartford: Belknap & Ham-*  
*eraly.*

is it of all attempts to portray the female mind and heart! If the words and ways, the style of thinking and the modes of acting, all that goes to make up biography, have a character sufficiently marked to individualize the subject, there is danger that, in the relating, she may seem to have overstepped the decorum of her sex, and so forfeit the interest with which only true delicacy can invest the woman.

It is strange that biography should ever succeed. To reproduce anything that was transient and is gone, not by repetition as in a strain of music, but by delineating the emotions it caused, is an achievement of high art. An added shade of coloring shows you an enthusiast, and loses you the confidence and sympathy of your cooler listener. A shade subtracted leaves so faint a hue that you have lost your interest in your own faded picture, and of course can not command that of another. Even an exact delineation, while it may convey accurately a part of the idea of a character, is not capable of transmitting the more volatile and subtle shades. You may mix your colors never so cunningly, and copy never so minutely every fold of every petal of the rose, and hang it so gracefully on its stem as to present its very port and bearing, but where is its fragrance, its exquisite texture, and the dewy freshness which was its crowning grace?

So in biography, you may make an accurate and ample statement of facts,—you may even join together in a brightly colored mosaic the fairest impressions that can be given of the mind of another—his own recorded thoughts and feelings—and yet they may fail to present the individual. They are stiff and glaring, wanting the softening transition of the intermediate parts and of attending circumstances.

And yet biography does sometimes succeed, not merely in rais-

ing a monumental pile of historical statistics, and maintaining for the friends of the departed the outlines of a character bright in their remembrance; but in shaping forth to others a life-like semblance of something good and fair, and distinct enough to live with us thenceforward, and be loved like a friend, though it be but a shadow.

Such has been the feeling with which we have read and re-read the volume before us. We knew but slightly her who is the subject of it, and are indebted to the memoir for anything like a conception of the character; consequently, we can better judge of its probable effect upon other minds. We pronounce it a portrait successfully taken—a piece of uncommonly skillful biography. There is no gaudy exaggerations in it, no stiffness, no incompleteness. We see the individual character we are invited to see, and in contemplating it, we have all along a feeling of personal acquisition. We have found rare treasure; a true woman to be admired, a daughter whose worth surpasses estimation, a friend to be clasped with favor to the heart, a lovely young Christian to be admired and rejoiced over, and a self-sacrificing missionary to be held in reverential remembrance. Unlike most that is written to commemorate the dead, or that unveils the recesses of the human heart, this is a cheerful book. It breathes throughout the air of a spring morning. As we read it we inhale something as pure and fragrant as the wafted odor of—

“—old cherry-trees  
Sheeted with blossoms.”

We stand beneath a serene unclouded sky, and all around us is floating music as enlivening as the song of birds, yet solemn as the strains of the sanctuary. It is that of a life in unison from its childhood to its close; rising indeed like “an unbroken hymn of praise to God.”

There is no austerity in its piety, no levity in its gladness. It shows that "virtue in herself is lovely," but if "goodness" is ever "awful," it is not here in the company of this young happy Christian heart.

We have heard sometimes that a strictly religious education has a tendency to restrict the intellectual growth of the young, and to mar its grace and freedom. We have been told that it was not well that our sons and daughters should commit to memory texts and catechisms, lest the free play of their fancy should be checked, and they be rendered mechanical and constrained in their demeanor, and dwarfish in their intellectual stature. We see nothing of this exemplified in this memoir. One may look long to find an instance of more lady-like and graceful accomplishment, of more true refinement, of more liberal and varied cultivation, of more thorough mental discipline, of more pliable and available information, of a more winning and wise adaptation to persons and times and places, than the one presented in these pages. And yet this fair flower grew in a cleft of rugged Calvinism; the gales which fanned it were of that "wind of doctrine" called rigid orthodoxy. We know the soil in which it had its root. We know the spirit of the teachings which distilled upon it like the dew. The tones of that pulpit still linger in our ears, familiar as those of *that good old bell*,\* and we are sure that there

is no pulpit in all New England more uncompromising in its demands, more strictly and severely searching in its doctrines.

But let us look more closely at the events of this history of a life, and note their effect in passing, upon the character of its subject.

Mary, daughter of the Rev. Dr. Hawes, of Hartford, Conn., was born in 1821. The death of a sister a little older, and of two brothers younger than herself, left her the only daughter, and for some time the only child of the family. Her father says of her:—

"It is a very pleasant remembrance to her parents, that from her earliest years she was a peculiarly affectionate and dutiful child. Her tender mind opened itself in docility and love; and like a fresh flower of spring, shed forth the fragrance of its affections upon all around. To know the desires of her father, or mother, was enough to engage a prompt and cheerful obedience. She was early taught that she was a sinner, and needed the renewing grace of God to fit her for his service and kingdom; and from the time she was eight years of age, she was the subject of more than usually deep religious impressions. She felt that her heart was not right with God; that she needed what every human being, however young, and however amiable, needs, a new heart to be given her by the Holy Spirit.

"On entering her tenth year, there was a marked change in her feelings. The scene was one never to be forgotten, either by herself or her parents. It was noticed, that, for some days, her mind was the subject of intense and serious thought. Occasionally the unbidden tear would be seen trembling in the eye, or

\* "Our new and deep-toned bell rings this day for the first time, calling us to that church we love so well. I shall love this I know, though 'tis not the bell of my childhood. That good old bell! connected as it was with so many of the happiest seasons of my life—whose tones were the familiar ones of my earliest moments; could I help loving it? My father says, I shall not hear that bell in Smyrna. No, its tones will not reach me there. There will come a time, when I shall no more go up to that sanctuary, which has been my Sabbath home from

my earliest years; when I shall no more join in its holy services. But I am not cast down; through my tears, I can look to a more glorious temple above, where God and the Lamb forever dwell. No, no; this dear place of worship, that has nurtured many plants of piety, will be called mine no more, when I depart from the home of my youth; but if I humbly walk in the ways of piety, and lean upon Jesus for strength, may I not hope that he will go with me in all my wanderings, make me bold and faithful in his service, and that he will cause the truths which I have here heard, to spring up in my heart, and bear fruit forever."—p. 147.

stealing down the cheek, till, one evening, having spent some time in retirement, she was heard singing in a low, sweet voice, when on opening the door of her room, her delightful exclamation was, 'Oh, I am so happy; I have found God; I am so happy; I can pray now.' She had knelt, as at other times, with a burdened heart, and under a sense of separation from God, and he had met her and had blessed her. To use her own language; 'it seemed like speaking to a dear, kind friend; God seemed near to me; and I felt that he heard me.' From that time she gave us every pleasant evidence of being a child of God. Her youthful piety did not, as it often does, pass away like a morning cloud. It was a plant of celestial origin. It was rooted deep in the heart, and it grew and brought forth increasing fruit to God till the end of her life."—pp. 361, 362.

The following scene, which belongs to this period, or a little earlier in her childhood, has hardly a parallel for beauty and true pathos.

"A little previous to the death of this brother, an incident occurred which drew out her strong powers of sympathy, and very strikingly illustrated her forgetfulness of self, when she saw others in affliction, and also her very felicitous manner of imparting consolation. The disease had assumed a very alarming form, and the little sufferer was rent with convulsions, which it required no ordinary share of fortitude only to witness. The poor father, unable longer to endure the sight, turned away from the bed, and sought his room. Mary followed him. He threw himself upon the sofa, exclaiming, 'I can't bear it, I can't bear it;' and he seemed to be struggling with emotions too painful to be borne. He had already been bereaved of three children, and now a fourth was about to be taken, and in a very distressing manner. He again exclaimed, 'The hand of God is upon me; I don't know but I am to be written childless.' Mary drew her seat closer to his, and laying her hand gently on his knee to gain his attention, she looked up in his face and said, 'Father, you told us that God always had a *good reason* for every thing he did. And has he not a *good reason now*? and is it not right for him to make my little brother suffer so?' Finding her arguments unavailing as she supposed, to soothe him, because that now he wept more freely, she took down from the shelf a hymn-book, and opening it, said, 'Dear father, let me comfort you, let me read a hymn to you, shall I?' The father's heart was too full to speak, and she opened to that very appropriate hymn of Doddridge, commencing,

'Peace, 'tis the Lord Jehovah's hand—  
When she came to the verse,

'Fair garlands of immortal bliss  
He weaves for every brow,  
And shall rebellious passions rise  
When he corrects us now?'

Her countenance shone as if a beam from heaven had shed its light there, and her voice and manner were such as seemed better befitting an angel than a frail child. A relative of the family had followed Mary and her father to the study, and had been a silent, but almost unnoticed observer of the whole; so absorbed was the father in his grief, and Mary in her attempts to soothe him. She said the scene was more touching, on account of the state of Mary at the time, who having just risen from a sick bed, was still weak and pale. She seemed also to be overwhelmed with the consciousness of her little brother's sufferings, to whom she was tenderly attached, and to feel that she must not now lay her bursting heart upon her father's bosom, for he needed comfort and support himself. In the trying emergency, she looked away from human sympathy, and sought in God something which might meet the painful circumstances of the case; and she thus, meekly, though unintentionally, taught a lesson of submission to his perfect will.

"Her father, in speaking of it afterwards, remarked, that he 'had never before been so dealt with;' that 'she talked like an experienced Christian.'"—pp. 20-22.

Following her course as she advanced in youth, we are no where surprised at the development of any remarkable powers of mind. She was prayerful and conscientious, diligent in acquiring knowledge, enthusiastic in her love of nature, evincing in everything a refined and feminine taste, and a quick perception of the beautiful in art, in literature, and in morals. But the charm of her character lay in her warmth of heart. Love was the element in which she lived. She loved God—she loved her parents—she loved her companions—she loved every body. It was the exuberant, gushing love of childhood, exalted by the influences of true piety. She seems never to have known what it was to be repelled by a sense of weakness or unworthiness in another, or to have had any

of those dislikes and distastes and unchristian aversions, which keep so many of us apart. She had no need to "unlearn contempt." This was partly the result of natural temperament, but not all. Such love is a Christian grace. He that "hath" it, has it because he "dwelleth in God and God in him." It is the charity which Paul inculcated; that which "thinketh no evil," which "hopeth" and "believeth all things." It has its root in humility; it grows only by the uprooting of self. He who would cultivate it, must follow the injunction to "let nothing be done through strife or vain-glory, but in lowliness of heart esteem others better than himself." As Jesus took a little child and set him in the midst to teach his disciples, so would we place this young Christian woman in the assemblies of some who are "called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi," that they may learn from her "which be the first principles" of the Christian life.

But let no one suppose that there was any weakness or want of just discrimination in the subject of this memoir. It is true that the gentler elements predominated in her character, and her father probably knew what she needed, when he gave her the playful advice to "have more of *Cato*." Without Christian principle, she might have been a victim of morbid sensitiveness, or ever at the mercy of fluctuating impulses; but religion supplied the tonic she needed, and by the grace of God, aiding her own efforts, we see her possessed of firmness of purpose and moral courage enough to rebuke many of us who are made of sterner stuff.

Mary (we borrow the pleasant name by which her mother calls her,) seems to have passed through two eras in her mental history. One was the sudden expansion of her intellectual and social nature. She speaks of a winter passed in the family of the Rev. Dr. Fitch of New Haven, under the immediate

influence of his lamented lady, as one in which she seemed to have lived a lifetime, so many new thoughts and feelings had been awakened, and her views of life were all so changed. The folded bud, fully prepared, was brought into a peculiarly favorable position, and burst at once into full flower.

The other was an equally marked advancement of her religious views during the revival of 1841 in Hartford. This was no transient impulse, but continued to brighten with new luster the remainder of her course. To illustrate this change, we place the following extract from a letter to an intimate friend, beside some passages taken from her subsequent journal and letters:—

"Dear C., the foundations of my soul, seem all breaking away. I never felt so entirely adrift in the universe, without compass or anchor, as I do at present. All that I thought firmly fixed in my heart is gone, and I shrink from the year, as bringing only new helplessness at a time when I need all my energies. Forgive me, my dear friend, for troubling you with these things. A letter on the eve of another great period which marks off the time of frail, perishing mortals, should be full of hope—of encouragement; and forgetting the past, should look towards the glorious future—the coming existence, when the strife with evil shall have ended. But thus I am little able to write now. The few longings I have ever had for the strife, seem all quenched. If I thought this state of mind was to last, I should be miserable. Perhaps I have fallen into some 'slough of despond,' but if so, it must be a very different one from Christian's, for there appears no helping hand. I am not jesting, my dear C., neither am I indulging myself in a melancholy dream; but a conviction of what I am, and my utter inability to be any better, has so weighed upon me lately, as to drive almost every thing else from my mind. Do you know what I can do? If you have any talisman to still the unquiet beatings of my heart, send it to me I pray you.

"Why am I so selfish as to write thus to you? I am sure I did not sit down to the unmerciful task of making you acquainted with my utter destitution, but it was with the laudable intention of wishing you a 'happy new year,'—happy in the consciousness of a daily increase in all that is worthy of an immortal and re-

deemed soul. O, my friend, press on that glorious path with renewed ardor. Our Savior has marked the way, and will ever be near, to guide and strengthen, and to bring you safe to the hills of light. I dare not think of those everlasting hills. It blinds my eyes with tears; for the long, weary path, full of difficulties, snares, temptations, corruptions, comes into my view, and fills me with gloomy forebodings. It does not seem as though I can ever get over them. Evil habits so fixed in the deepest recesses of the heart—love of the world, with its poor perish-ing trifles, dragging the spirit down to earth. Will they drag it down forever? Can no one break the strong fetters? But this does not sound very much like the words of a believer in all the promises so glorious and precious, written on every page of God's holy word. The very fact that I am a believer in them, makes me still sadder, for if I believed rightly, I should have no more discouragements."—pp. 67, 68.

"There is delightful work going on in our city, of which I have been longing to tell you; for many you knew and loved are hoping in Christ. It is nearly two months since the commencement of the revival, which has been mostly among the young people. The way had sometime been preparing for this, when Mr. K. came and spent one month here, preaching every afternoon to professors of religion, and in the evening to others, particularly to those who were not Christians.

"The remembrance of those seasons is like a green spot in this desert world. We came forth from our dark places, and stood in the light of the sun of righteousness; we cast off our garments of mourning, and put on the garments of praise, and already the glory from the celestial city seemed beaming down upon us. It seems to us now, as though we can never go back to the troubled streams of this world, having tasted of the streams which flow from the throne of God and the Lamb."—pp. 72, 73.

"Never did I feel my heart *leap* in joy as it does this morning. Oh, M., is it not delightful to live in the service of so good a being as our reconciled Father in Christ? Is it not good to yield all to his blessed control, and know no will but his? Surely there is more blessedness in doing his will, than in anything else that this life can yield us. If the few scattering joys which have entered our benighted hearts here, make us so happy, what must the full glory of that life be, where no sin can obstruct the gushings of peace and joy. I write unconnectedly, dear M., for my heart is so full I can not give expression to what I would say. I never thought that I could be so peaceful in the service of God, nor have such a sweet,

tranquil frame of mind, as I have enjoyed for a few days past. Now I give up every doubt and fear, and trusting only in my Savior, am willing I humbly hope, to do all he appoints. Dear M., I did not mean to occupy this note with my own feelings, but they would come out. Oh, to sing praises to our Savior! He who has redeemed us from our sins, and given to us the hope of eternal life!"—p. 90.

"I have a peace this summer such as I never felt before. There are indeed many things without, which do try me not a little. It is a very eventful season, and will, in all probability, decide the destiny of my life. These passing events bring with them many perplexities and trials, which would weigh me down, if I could not look to God and say, 'Thy will be done.' I am pondering many things, and there is a ceaseless rush of thought, which sometimes makes my brain almost wild. And then I have so many duties, that my time is more than occupied—and I have sin and selfishness to subdue within, for my heart is revealing its dreadful corruptions—and I have friends to pray for, whose condition weighs on my spirit—but in the midst of it all, I think I can trust in God, and leave all with him.

"I do hope that I live to do his holy will. It is my desire ever to wait on him as *Father, Savior and Sanctifier*—to take every duty as it comes up before me, with an earnest desire to do God's will in it—to bear every trial, and enjoy every blessing, in such a manner as will fit me for the other world, whenever God may see fit to call me from this."—pp. 97, 98.

"*I felt free and happy as a bird.* \* \* \* I blessed my Father in Heaven for the beauty there is in our fair earth, and holy thoughts of his love came floating into my mind. I was not troubled with vanity as I had formerly been on such occasions; and yet I feel almost afraid to say so, for I know the same selfish feelings remain, yet they do not give me so much trouble, nor occasion, as they once did, such a ceaseless inquietude within. I know that if I do God's will, that is all that is of importance to me."—p. 102.

"Sabbath noon. I have just returned from a sweet season, for which my heart blesses God, my Savior. Oh, these are refreshing seasons in our pilgrimage. They come as gleams to our path even now, though far from our Father's home. He sends his love to us, and here in this lower world, we may sing the songs of the redeemed. \* \* \* How sweet, how joyful, to rest my all on Jesus, to lean on him, and know no fear! Here I can praise him only faintly. In that day when this mortal robe is cast aside, I will raise my voice in a ceaseless song of grat-

tude, 'unto Him who hath loved us, and given himself to die for us.'"—pp. 106, 107.

"I have had sweet thoughts of Jesus and his faithful love. So great! It is wonderful; and I so poor and vile! The least thought makes my eyes overflow, for I am weak. I am happy and trusting to night. When I look inward, all is indeed very dark and sinful, but I look away to Christ and all is bright, and I pray for my precious ones, and for this whole world, that Jesus may reign."—p. 121.

Probably the decision to which she had now come, to forsake all that was so dear to her, and devote her life to missionary labor, as seemed clearly to be her duty by the leadings of Providence, had much to do with the peace of mind which marks the whole of her history thenceforward; but it is beautiful to contemplate it, and learn with what happiness child-like obedience can fill the Christian heart. The following record of her feelings during severe illness, is too beautiful to be omitted. It takes us into the green pastures and beside the still waters where the good Shepherd feeds his flock:—

"I have been brought to the borders of the grave, from which it has pleased God to raise me, so that now I am fast recovering. I have been down stairs for a little while, and have touched again my dear piano. But I am still very weak, and sit in my easy chair very quietly, reading some, and sewing some, but thinking most of the time. And oh, I thank God for the sweet thoughts he grants me.

"I can look back on the whole scene, and view it only in the light of a blessing. I had very little suffering, principally weakness; but I was so ill, that my parents gave up all hope, and my physicians felt there was scarcely a chance for my recovery. And yet, through the whole my mind was clear. I knew all which was going on around me, felt my danger, and thought that I should die. It pleased God to give me great calmness, without which it would have been impossible for my disease to have been checked; for excitement was the thing most feared. I left the event entirely in my Savior's hand. I trusted all to him, and knew that if it was his will, I should recover; if not, I trusted he would not leave me at the last. It is a

miracle that I am spared. I am filled with wonder! I can only say, 'Lord, this life I devote all to thee.'

"In this room I have passed, and am passing, some most delightful days. I can not think of the kindness of all my friends, without the greatest wonder. It makes me very humble. I have had one overflowing stream of blessings, ever since the commencement of my illness. All my wants have been anticipated. The kindest friends have been around my bed side—the best care has been taken of me. Every thing that love could devise, has been done. My dear Mrs. Fitch came all the way from New Haven, and took care of me a night and a day. Oh, my cup has been full of blessings! The loveliest flowers have bloomed on my table, and the choicest fruits, since I began to recover, have been before me. But this is not the half.

"It has pleased my Heavenly Father to give me a more happy and peaceful spirit, than I have ever before enjoyed. I have the sweetest verses and hymns in my memory, and my communings on my bed, have been most precious. The dark valley of death, looks not near so dark, since I have been so near it, and heaven seems near all the time.

"I have yet many sins over which to mourn, but it seems as though my Savior permits me to lay my head on his bosom, and weep over them there, and supplicate grace and pardon for myself and all my dear friends. I love my friends and every body, and every thing, ten thousand times more than I did before. The sun never shone so brightly, nor the moon so peacefully; and yet I love God, and Jesus, and heaven as much better. The Bible never seemed half so precious. I can only look to God, and pray him to keep me close under the shadow of his wing, since it seems his will I should live a little longer here. I think this is one of the lessons I needed to learn before entering on my labors in a distant land. Of these I think much. And I have sweet thoughts of my absent friend. I thought of him when I supposed myself dying, and did wish to see him; but I can trust that all to my Father's care and keeping."—pp. 122-124.

Not to dwell too long on this part of her history, to us the most beautiful, which shows her to us the graceful ornament of her home, and the active sharer in every good work in her father's congregation, we pass to the period of her departure from home. We should like to illustrate by copious extracts, the thorough preparation she was

making for the field upon which she was entering, but they may all be condensed in this:—

“I have resolved to go no step alone. I consecrate to Jesus my time, my studies, my friends, my earthly store, and ask him to guide me every moment. Oh, he whose love brought him to die for us, will he not give us all things necessary to enable us to live for him? Oh, I know he will. My only resolution, or rather all my resolutions, are comprised in this one thing, ‘trust in Christ daily and hourly.’”—pp. 171, 172.

In September, 1843, Miss H. was married to the Rev. Henry I. Van Lennep, and in the following October, sailed with him for his home in Smyrna. She had the rare privilege of being accompanied on this voyage by her father, who went, in connexion with the Rev. Dr. Anderson, of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, to visit the stations of the board in Turkey and Syria. A hasty note sent back by the pilot-boat to her mother, shews the cheerful spirit of a parting, which must have been only a little less severe than the final severing of soul and body.

“Dear mother, my own dear mother, you are not sorry we are going. You know why we go. It is not for our own pleasure; it is God who has appointed our way; and I do think we go for Him, and shall live for Him in every thing.

“Dear mother, pray that we may be wholly devoted to our Savior; that the salvation of all may appear so important to us, that we shall be always earnestly engaged in leading many to Christ. Pray that we may never forget the object of our mission. Good bye, my precious mother, we are all in God’s hand, and God can sustain us. I have not a fear if God will only enable us to do right.”—pp. 192-193.

We place beside it her beautiful farewell to her father, written some months later, when he was about returning to America, leaving her at her post of labor.

“My own precious father,—God will take care of you on the great waters, and will bring you safely to your dear home and people, and we, shall we not pray for you and send our hearts with you; and

does time or distance separate us? Oh no, my dear father, time and distance can not break the ties which bind our hearts together; for we are united by our Father in Heaven, and it is his love which makes us *one company, one family* still. Do not think that H. and I are ‘as far off;’ it will not be true if you do. We are close to you, and God up in the heaven, who sees our hearts, looks upon us as if we were not separated. Oh, my dear father, it is good to be in his hands, to know no will but his, to work just where he appoints and just how he appoints. We thank God that he has brought you here. You will never know the good you have done in this world. It has been a sweet comfort to H. and me, and every word of yours is treasured in our memory. I thank you (*thank* is a poor word) for every counsel you have ever given me; for every prayer you have prayed for me; for all the sermons I have heard you preach; for all our pleasant talks together.

“Dear father, you will not be sorry that we are working on missionary ground, when you get to heaven. How I shall remember and live upon your last words at the meeting. It was a good meeting, and I wish we could keep heaven every moment in our mind. And now go home to dear mother, and comfort her heart, and train up dear E. to be a missionary, and tell all my young friends that there is a great and a blessed work to be done in this world, and they have but one life to do it in. Oh, beseech them to be in earnest about doing good. I have never been half earnest enough about it.

“Our hearts go with you. Do not you believe it, dear father? Why will you still think we are after all separated? What is a mass of water or a piece of earth? It does not keep our hearts apart; it may have power over the body, but never any power over the spirit. May God help us to believe this, and to live in the sweet hope of spending our eternity around his throne. And, now dear father, I embrace you and kiss away all your tears, and I am your own affectionate Daughter.”—pp. 284, 285.

We have said that her father left her at her post of labor. Had that been the case, her missionary life would have wanted its brightest act of self-sacrifice. At Smyrna, she was in the midst of her husband’s family circle, and surrounded by many comforts which do not fall to the lot of most missionaries. She was yet to shew that she could *forsake all* for Christ. Let one or two

extracts introduce the reader to the refined domestic circle she was now called to leave.

"I find myself in the midst of a warm-hearted, affectionate, sincere circle, who treat me as one of them. I have every thing I could wish, so far as their intercourse with me is concerned. Mrs. V. L. is a very lovely lady, and it is a pleasure to call her 'mamma,' and look up to her for counsel and guidance. In her I have found one who in a measure supplies the need I feel for my own precious mother." —pp. 247, 248.

"I have told you of the meeting with H.'s friends, and to the time when I entered his mother's room, all bewildered and weak, and found a resting place on the sofa. That first day of my Smyrna life was full of thoughts. \* \* \* During the afternoon I slept, and when waking heard the clock, which stands in the corridor, striking five, and I had the half bewildered feeling which one has on waking in a strange place, after strange events. Mamma and H. sat in the room with me, and other members of the family came in for a few moments. It was soon dark, and they all left me for supper, and my Greek woman came with something for me. Then I lay alone on the sofa, and while dozing heard the family singing their evening hymn after prayers. The voices all blended so perfectly, and the music came in such a deep rich strain, in half chanting style, that I lay spell bound, my whole frame thrilled. The words were 'Our days are as the grass,' and though I could not distinguish them, they sang with so much expression I could almost tell the sentiments." \*

"The day after my arrival was the Sabbath, you know. The Sabbaths at Mrs. V. L.'s are very still. All go to the Dutch chapel at ten in the morning, and in the afternoon, mamma and several of the family attend the missionary service, which is also in the chapel. From my room I heard no street sounds, for the house is in a court. Occasionally a camel bell, and the bells of the churches, which ring at eight, twelve, and four, during the week, and every half hour on the Sabbath. These were almost all the sounds that came to my room. The bright blue sky looked in at the window, the evening gun sounded at half past seven, the partridges made their voices heard on the terrace, for E. was taming some, and the favorite cat would jump on the window and mew to be admitted. Thus I had few sounds to remind me I was in Asia. Yet many strange things would come under my observation, and even in my room I gradually became acquainted with Smyrna life, and Smyrna beings.

As I was able to bear it, the relatives of the family would come one at a time and have a little pleasant chat with me. On Monday afternoon the Consul called. He had called before, but I had not been able to see him, and when he came the second time, mamma thought I had better receive him. I dreaded the meeting, yet he was so kind, and his blessing was so patriarchal, that I quickly felt easy." —pp. 241-243.

It was during the illness to which she alludes, that the plan of her husband's removal to Constantinople, rendered desirable by a proposed re-organization of the missions of the board, was communicated to her. This movement was some time in suspense, and of it she says:

"At first my heart died within me; but I prayed much over it. You know how all my interests were in Smyrna, and then I had got the idea that H.'s influence was necessary to his family. The plan seemed pleasant to H., though the idea of leaving his home was trying to him. He felt that the station in the high school was the place for him, and just suited his tastes; and that so long as he was a missionary his great work must be on unevangelized ground, and that however badly he and his family felt about separating, yet, if he could do more good in any other field he must go. I tried to feel just as he did, and became more and more reconciled to it. Sabbath was a precious day indeed; we talked and prayed over all our affairs, and felt comforted that God would order all things right." —p. 245.

"How long to lay aside the evil of my heart and the prejudices I have. You know I have always disliked a school, and a boarding school particularly, and I am distressed that I should feel this still. I mean to put it all down, for I am convinced it is foolish as well as sinful." \* \* \* "Sometimes my heart died within me—to be at the head of a seminary, and to have no home but in a boarding school." \* \* \* "I love a quiet way of living too well to make the idea of becoming a matron very pleasant. This causes me, I fear, to magnify the difficulties; and then my heart clings to Smyrna. The matter is all to be talked over—to be considered in all its lights, and *may God direct!*" —pp. 258, 259.

How much practical good sense there was in her views of her station and its duties, is shewn in the following passage.

"I believe it is a general fact, that the Orientals are regarded by us Americans as semi-barbarians, or at best as grown-up children. Nothing is more erroneous. The more we associate with them, the more we feel that they are entitled to respect and friendship, as much so as any polite, agreeable people in our own land, who are without true religion. With them we must observe the same strict rules of propriety, the same careful attention to win them to the truth without disgusting them. They have the same hopes, fears, affections that we have, but their views of religious truth are dark and cheerless. To pray long prayers, and to observe strictly the fasts, are the great things with them. They know no higher motive from which to act, than self-interest, and consequently are not guided by principle.

"What the missionary has to do on first coming out, is to hire a house, engage teacher of the language he wishes to learn, and strive as fast as possible to become acquainted with Oriental habits and modes of thinking. By degrees he gets introduced to one and another, as any person in coming into a new place does. He interests those whom he designs to benefit, in various ways, and gradually leads them to converse upon serious subjects. It has been found productive of much evil to attack their religions directly. You must strive to win their confidence, and have familiar talks upon religious subjects with them. In this way you can gradually pour light into their minds, set them to inquiring, and sow some seeds of truth, which by God's blessing may spring up and bear fruit. Patience and perseverance are exceedingly needed by a missionary. You will perhaps be surprised when I tell you, that the greatest trial of a missionary, is the effect upon his own spirit, of mingling with such a mass of worldliness. Especially is this the case here, where there are so many things to interest, and where there are not the helps to a Christian course which are found in a land of Bibles and Sabbaths. Another great trial is to see so many whose minds are full of error, and to know that you can do comparatively little to remove it. Oh, how often my heart has ached, when I have looked upon the crowds that throng these streets, and know that there is scarce one among them all, who knows anything about true religion. It is sad to look at their crowded burial places, beneath the cypress trees, and think how dark their end has been."—262-264.

We should like to transcribe entire, some beautifully sketched scenes of her oriental life, but must content ourselves with a few passa-

ges, from which the reader may catch something of the *naïve* and sprightly manner of the writer.

"I have come to this charming place, (Sedecui,) at last, to spend the week. This morning we rose early and went in a boat to the opposite side of the city, beyond the barracks; where we found the horses and donkeys waiting for us. The donkey driver, Y., said he meant to make a good rider of me, but I confess I had some fear of mounting even the meek little fellow, sure footed and good, which was allotted me. Y. walked by my side, and I gathered courage as I went. The country is beautiful, so wild are the mountains, so lovely are the plains. There is a picturesque air over every thing. We passed many loaded camels. Sometimes we were riding along green hedges, sometimes on the edge of high hills and looking off on plains, over which olives and cypresses and vineyards are scattered. The grass is as green, and the flowers as blooming and fresh, and the sun as warm, as in New England in the month of May. The people are plowing and planting and arranging their vineyards. We reached Sedecui about twelve o'clock.

"We rested and then went at two o'clock to walk among the mountains. I wish you could have seen our brothers. I laughed till I was tired at their curious hunting gear. The very gypsies themselves could not have looked more romantic, and their hands and faces quite belied the rest of their appearance. I can not tell you as fully about Sedecui as I wish, but it is very beautiful. The houses are all near each other with very pleasant large gardens all around."

"*March 6th.* This morning H. took me into the large old house and garden where he and his brothers played when they were children. O, mamma, it is a place to dream of the past in. The old trees, now covered with ivy, could tell many a tale of those who have played beneath their shade, and grown old and passed away. We passed along the walks and talked of other days, and thought of the generations who have lived in these spots. Every thing was moss grown and ivy covered."—pp. 268, 269.

"It had been previously arranged that we should form a party to the Tchiflick\* on Wednesday, and so between four and five o'clock we were up, and our donkeys and donkey drivers were brought with the mules for our baggage. Baggage does not mean trunks, but pack-saddles, beds, bedding, &c. We took coffee and

\* Landed estate belonging to two of the six brothers of Mr. V. L.

were on our way before six o'clock. But I must describe. Did you ever see a donkey in America? I never did. But imagine a little animal something like a mule, only with a meeker and more silly face, so low in stature that when a tall person like father rides him, the feet almost touch the ground; and it is a sight worthy the brush of Hogarth. I have had so many donkey frolics that I have almost ceased laughing at donkey parties. Gentlemen generally ride horses, but at this season the horses are put to grass. Ladies look tolerably well upon these animals, but a gentleman looks strangely out of place.

"Our party consisted of H. and three of his brothers, all in hunting dresses, some with guns, some with pistols, and all together making quite a picturesque appearance, particularly as a hunting horn was slung over E.'s shoulder. C. alone bestrode a horse, and he rode behind to keep the loiterers with the party. Our two cousins, Emily and Helen, rode on country saddles, and a Greek donkey driver walked by their side. It is useless attempting any such persuasion as influences other animals; donkeys listen only to the voice and stick of their driver. L. and I wore broad straw hats which served in place of parasols, and which are convenient in riding. We all tip'd, tip'd along, wakening up the villagers with our merry horn, and they came flocking to their gates, half dressed and half asleep.

"We do not meet houses scattered here and there as in America, but ride along narrow paths, such as you would call by-roads, with low trees or brush wood on either side, and sometimes between hedges which are so high above the road, and covered by creeping vines, that they half arch over the way. There are now and then, groves of olives, and many detached trees, such as the almond, (like our peach,) the willow, the pine, the platanus, wild pear, &c., and an endless variety of low shrubs and thorn trees; but you would miss as I do, the tall thick forests of our land. You would look in vain for a rail fence, or a little farm house rising among the trees. If you saw any red roofs, there would be a red tiled village with a mosque and cypress trees clustering together. About an hour after starting we reached a caffeney at the end of a miserable village all in ruins, and dismounting we sat upon the stones by the well and took coffee. Then we entered upon a long, long plain, at the other end of which, just at the base of the mountains, the little cottages of the Tchiflick lie. We saw their red roofs for a long time before reaching them, as they stand upon ground somewhat elevated. Now and then a few black tents of the wandering Turkomans appeared, far to

the right and left of our road, and camels which they had turned out to graze would lift their strange faces occasionally as we passed. The Tchiflick is the great hobby of our family, for besides being full of the most majestic scenery, it is a farm in which American and European improvements in agriculture are being made. Every improvement is so intimately connected with the missionary enterprise, that the Tchiflick can not but interest the friends of missions. Already the American plough is introduced, and they hope before long to establish a carriage road between Sedecui and the Tchiflick. It is a large estate, being six miles one way, and three the other, and it is a most charming spot. There is an immense garden of fruit trees and vegetables; and the forest trees there are larger than any where else. Indeed, among those beautiful mountain trees which shaded the gorge, I did not feel the want of the trees of America."—pp. 291-293.

Following her to Constantinople, where we are told that they "have both come fully determined to be as happy and to do as much good as is in their power," we have followed her almost as far as we can, for she stands on the verge of translation to "that better country"—that "home eternal in the heavens." A few months more, full of cheerful activity in preparation to live among a strange people, and to overcome the first difficulties of their language, and she has finished her course on earth. This was indeed a sudden and unexpected termination of her hopes and plans, and of those of the friends, who, in yielding her up to the missionary work, felt that they had laid their choicest treasure upon God's altar.

A few passages from some of her latest letters, will show her fervency of affection for her distant friends, and her ripeness of preparation for the change before her.

"Your ardently expected letter from Trieste, reached us on the third of this month, and it did make me very sad. Dear father, will not Christ be your comforter? Will not He be more to you than any thing else? Will He not comfort us all in this separation, and give us the joy of knowing that it is all for His glory." \* \* \*

"The day we left Smyrna, we did feel sad; but we had a fine voyage, and es-

joyed the glorious view exceedingly. And now H. and I are separated from both our homes, and from the dear friends and companions of our early years; but God is with us, and he will be our Father, and will be the Father of all our dear circle. We have appointed separate evenings to pray for our friends—Monday for missions, and our missionary friends—Tuesday, for our Smyrna Friends—Wednesday, for our American friends, and Thursday evening for our American relatives—you, and dear mamma, E. and aunt M.'s family—Friday is for our own work. We have Thursday for you, because it is the evening of your lecture. These are our stated times; but besides these, do not our hearts *daily* and *continually* ascend to God for you? It is a great comfort to me that I remember with such minute distinctness, every thing about my home. There is a freshness about every thing in the past, a vividness at times overwhelming. I can call up day after day, hour after hour, with all its attending events, conversations, looks and emotions. Almost every time I lie down, some scene in Hartford rises to memory—either the chaise is just ready, and I ride down by the South church with you; or I am sitting with my dear mother in her own room, talking of the future, which is now present. Often, often, when you will think of me as being interested in some scene in my new home, if you could see our spirit, you would find that both H. and I had come to visit you.”—pp. 302, 303.

“For some weeks my health has been very feeble, and the world has grown very dim, and I bless God who has in mercy afflicted me, so that I might look up to that better world, which should occupy our chief attention. Dear S., this world is not to be our home. Let us rejoice in this. A few days of care will soon pass, and then we, and those we love, will begin a blessed existence in the presence of our Saviour, who will make all our hearts happy through all eternity. But how little we think of heaven, and how we start at the thought of dying. Yes, dying is a solemn thing. I shrink when I think of the hour of death. But then I say, ‘will Jesus leave those who put their trust in him?’ Oh, no, we may safely confide in him, and he will take away all fear of death, and he will put such sweet thoughts of heaven into our minds, and of the lovely company of redeemed ones who are gathered there, that we shall no longer look upon this life as desirable, but shall joyfully meet death as a messenger sent to carry us to our beautiful, our glorious home. I think our views of heaven will depend very much upon the manner in which we view Christ. He is the chief attraction in

heaven, and he must have our highest love, if we would hope to have heaven attractive. If we meditate much upon the perfect character of our Almighty Saviour, we shall see how adapted he is to satisfy our hearts. Yes, dear S., he can satisfy as no other being can; and I trust you have long ere this found it out. But if you are troubled at finding that Christ is not all to you that you wish him to be, though you do sincerely put your trust in him; the best way to remedy this is to think very much of him, to strive to have your thoughts go up often to him, and also to pray earnestly that he will show you how lovely he is. Christ has sources of comfort and happiness in himself, which he is ready to impart to us, and of which we now little dream. Our minds are too dark to see his loveliness. Oh, when will these clouds be rolled away? Dear S., let us no longer think of him as a being far away, but as a kind and faithful friend, who loves us with so tender a love, that he longs to draw us to his bosom, and make us forever happy. But you may think, dear S., that I intend writing a sermon instead of a letter, and I will tell you frankly, that these thoughts have dwelt so much in my mind of late, that I could not refrain from writing them.”—pp. 325, 326.

Mrs. Van Lennep died at Constantinople, September 27, 1844, in the twenty-third year of her age, only one year and twenty-three days from her marriage-day, and before she had fully entered upon the life to which she had consecrated herself. Of her it has been as truly as beautifully said :

“Thy labor in the vineyard closed,  
Long ere the noon-tide sun,  
The dew still glistened on the leaves,  
When thy short task was done.”

And yet this life, “so little in itself,” may be found to have an “importance in its consequences”\* hardly anticipated at first by those who, overwhelmed by this sudden and mysterious providence, were ready to exclaim, “To what purpose is this waste?” Her day of influence will extend beyond the noon or the even-tide of an ordinary life of labor. “Sweet Mary Hawes,” (as she is named by one who never saw her, and whose knowledge of her is

all derived from the volume we have been reviewing,) shall long live in these pages,\* embalmed in unfading youth, to win and to guide many to Him, at whose feet she sat and learned to "choose the better part." Her pleasant voice will be heard in our homes, assuring our daughters that "there is no sphere of usefulness more pleasant than theirs;" bidding them believe that "it is a comfort to take the weight of family duties from a mother, to soothe and cheer a wearied father, and a delight to aid a young brother in his evening lesson, and to watch his unfolding mind."† They shall catch her alacrity and cheerful industry, and her "facility in saving the fragments of time," and making them tell in something tangible" accomplished in them. They shall be admonished not to waste feeling in discontented and romantic dreaming, or in sighing for opportunities of doing good on a great scale, till they have filled up as thoroughly and faithfully as she did, the smaller openings for usefulness near at hand.

She shall lead them by the hand to the Sabbath school teacher's humble seat, on the tract distributor's patient circuit, or on errands of mercy into the homes of sickness and destitution,—into the busy sewing-circle, or the little group gathered for social prayer. It is well too that they should have such a guide, for the offense of the cross has not yet ceased, and the example of an accomplished and highly educated young female will not fail of its influence upon others of the same class, who wish to be Christians, and yet are so much afraid of

every thing that may seem to border on *religious cant*, as to shrink back from the prayer-meeting, and from active personal efforts for the salvation of others. Her cheerful piety shall persuade us that "*it is indeed the simplest, the easiest, the most blessed thing in the world, to give up the heart to the control of God*, and, by daily looking to him for strength to conquer our corrupt inclinations, *to grow in every thing that will make us like him.*"\* Her bright smile is worth volumes to prove that "*Jesus can indeed satisfy the heart,*"† and that if the experience of most of us has taught us to believe, that there is far more of conflict than of victory in the Christian warfare,—more shadow than sunshine resting upon the path of our pilgrimage, most of the fault lies in our own wayward choice. The child-like simplicity and serene faith of this young disciple, shall often rise to rebuke our anxious fears, and charm away our disquietudes with the whisper—"that sweet word *TRUST tells all.*" Her early consecration of her all to the great work of advancing the Redeemer's kingdom, shall rouse us who have less left of life to surrender, to redouble our efforts in spreading like "love and joy and peace" over the earth, lest when it shall be said of her, "She hath done what she could," it should also be added, "She hath done more than they all."

There has been no waste here,—no sacrifice, but that by which, in oriental alchymy, the bloom and beauty of the flower of a day is transmuted into the imperishable odor, and its fragrance concentrated, in order that it may be again diffused abroad to rejoice a thousand hearts. If any ask again, "To what purpose was this waste?"—we answer, "The Lord had need of it."

\* A second edition of the work, issued since the above was prepared, is indicative of the hold it has on the public. The references in this article are all to the first edition.

† Page 51.

‡ Ibid.

\* Page 161.

† Page 322.

**PROPOSED ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN WEST VIRGINIA.\***

THIS pamphlet of forty pages is from the pen of the Rev. Henry Ruffner, D.D., President of Washington College, Lexington, Va. The substance of the argument was first delivered in debate in "the Franklin Society," connected, as we suppose, with the College under the presidency of the author, who was afterwards induced by the urgent solicitation of a number of gentlemen, to throw it into its present shape for general circulation. It is an argument, as the title page shows, in favor of the abolition of slavery in West Virginia, not immediate, but gradual—not affecting the condition of the present slave population, but only of their posterity born after a certain date—not therefore an act of fealty to justice, involving a pecuniary sacrifice, but saving 'the rights and interests of slaveholders.'

This proposition, coming from a highly influential source—the more influential in the circumstances from the fact that the author is himself a slaveholder, sustained, as it is, by the most irrefutable proofs of the injurious influence of slavery upon that part of the "Old Dominion," is a token of good things to come, in which we, devoutly rejoice. It can not but arouse the citizens of Western Virginia, long irritated by the selfish policy of the East, to a resistless effort to throw off the incumbrance of slavery.

Dr. Ruffner opens his address by expressing his strong conviction, that a successful issue to the struggle

between East and West Virginia on the subject of representation, depends on connecting with it the abolition of slavery. He says to his fellow citizens :

" You claim the white basis of representation, on the republican principle that the majority shall rule. You deny that slaves, who constitute no part of the political body, shall add political weight to their masters, either as individual voters or as a mass of citizens. But the slaveholding interest, which is supreme in the East, is also powerful in some parts of the West. Let this be considered as a *perpetual* and a *growing* interest in our part of the state, and it may throw so much weight on the side of the eastern principle of representation, when the hour of decision comes, as to produce a compromise, and to secure to the East a part at least of what she claims on the ground of her vast slave property. But let all the West, on due consideration, conclude that slavery is a pernicious institution, and must be gradually removed; then, united in our views on all the great interests of our West Virginia, we shall meet the approaching crisis with inflexible resolution; and West Virginia can and must succeed in her approaching struggle for her rights and her prosperity.

" The more you consider the subject, the more you will be convinced that both these questions—the white basis and slavery—are of vital importance, and so intimately connected, that to insure success in either, we must unite them in our discussions both among ourselves and with East Virginia. On both should our views and our policy be firmly settled, when the crisis of 1850 shall arrive."—  
PP. 5, 6.

The crisis of 1850, is the taking of the next census, when it will appear whether the political power of the state will for the first time be transferred from the east to the west side of the Blue Ridge. Already the West has a majority of the white population, and we infer from the confidence with which Dr. Ruffner speaks, that in 1850 it will probably have a majority over the East, notwithstanding the inequality of representation, unless prevented by

\* Address to the People of West Virginia; shewing that slavery is injurious to the public welfare, and that it may be gradually abolished, without detriment to the rights and interests of slaveholders. By a Slaveholder of West Virginia. Lexington: Printed by R. C. Noel. 1847.

its own slave interest. This interest is constantly growing, and unless it shall be arrested by measures which look to free labor as the permanent policy of the future, it is to be feared that it will give a preponderance to the East, in the approaching conflict respecting the basis of representation. Dr. Ruffner makes use of this fact, to rouse his fellow citizens to immediate action, reminding them how incalculably West Virginia has suffered from her weakness in the Legislature. He refers to two facts, out of many which he says might be mentioned, 'to confirm them in the purpose to adhere inflexibly to their just claim of representation on the white basis, *without compromise*.' His statement of these facts we give at length in the following extract :

" Fifty years ago, when the country beyond the Ohio began to be opened for settlement, Virginia had already been for years in full and undisputed possession of her extensive territory on this side. The country between the Alleghany and the Ohio, containing eighteen millions of acres, much of it excellent soil, and abounding in mineral wealth, was an almost unbroken wilderness, and almost inaccessible to emigrants, for want of roads through the mountains. The feeble and detached settlements applied, and for thirty years continued to apply, *almost in vain*, for legislative aid to open wagon roads from the eastern settlements into their valleys. Let the Acts of Assembly for these thirty years of our infancy in West Virginia, be examined, and they will show how little, how *very* little, our eastern mother was willing to do to promote the growth of her nursing in the mountains. A few thousand dollars out of her rich treasury—very few indeed—and now and then some arrearage of taxes due from the poor settlers in the wilderness, was all that the government could be prevailed on to advance, for the purpose of opening this extensive territory for settlement, and to accommodate its secluded inhabitants.

" Now can any man doubt, that if the Legislature had, in the prosperous days of East Virginia, from 1794 to 1824, appropriated only ten or twelve thousand dollars a year to make good wagon roads through the mountain districts, that West Virginia would have increased in population and wealth far more than she did, or could do without roads? May we not af-

firm, that if East Virginia had pursued that just and enlightened policy, West Virginia would, twenty years ago, have been more populous than she was by 100,000 souls, and more wealthy in a still greater proportion? No man who has seen the effect of some lately-constructed roads, in promoting population and wealth can doubt it. And what shows more conclusively the blindness or illiberality of this Eastern policy towards the West, is, that the public treasury would have been remunerated, four fold at least, by the additional revenue which this early outlay for roads—had it been made—would have produced from the tax payers of West Virginia. Here we have one notable instance of what West Virginia has suffered from her dependence on an eastern Legislature. Though her growth in spite of eastern neglect, has enabled her of late years to get some valuable improvements made, she is still dependent for every boon of this kind, upon the will of those eastern people who are now a minority of the commonwealth.

" The other instance to which we intended to refer, is of still greater importance than the former. Many of you remember that in 1832, when a negro insurrection in Southampton county had filled nearly all Virginia with alarm, and made every white man think of the evils of slavery, a resolution was introduced into the Legislature, to adopt a system of gradual emancipation, by which the state might, in the course of fifty years, get rid of the evils of slavery.

" Whatever may be thought of such a measure in reference to East Virginia, where the slaves are more numerous than the whites; there can be no rational doubt that in West Virginia, the measure, had it been carried fifteen years ago, would by this time have wrought a most happy change in the condition and prospects of the country: and so the people of West Virginia then thought, for they were generally and warmly in favor of it, and zealously advocated it through their able and patriotic delegates. But in spite of their efforts, it was rejected by the all powerful eastern majority, though several eastern delegates joined the West in its support.

" We do not censure our eastern brethren for opposing this measure so far as their part of the state is concerned. But still, we of West Virginia must deem ourselves not only unfortunate, but grieved, when an eastern majority in the legislature debars us from obtaining measures conducive to our welfare, because these same measures may not suit the policy of East Virginia."—pp. 6, 7.

Instead of proposing a division of the state, and the erection of West

Virginia into an independent state, a measure which has for a long time been contemplated, Dr. Ruffner simply asks for the enactment of a law, if West Virginia shall call for it, "to remove slavery from her side of the Blue Ridge."

"Heretofore," he says, "no such scheme for West Virginia only has been proposed among us; and no state has abolished slavery in one part of her territory and retained it another. For this reason some persons may at first thought consider such a scheme as unfeasible. A state composed partly of free, and partially of slaveholding territory, may seem to present a political incongruity, and to be incapable of conducting its public affairs harmoniously. To relieve the minds of those who may feel apprehensions of this sort, we offer the following suggestions.

"1. Free states and slaveholding states have, during fifty-eight years, lived peaceably and prosperously under one Federal government. Sectional jealousies and occasional jars have occurred, but without evil consequence.

"2. Nothing in the nature of the case need create difficulty, except the framing of laws that may affect the rights and interests of slaveholders. But an amendment of the constitution could easily provide for the security of slaveholders in East Virginia against all unjust legislation, arising from the power or the anti-slavery principles of the West.

"3. After such an emancipation law as we propose, should be passed for West Virginia, no immediate change would take place in the institution of slavery among us; except that masters would probably choose to emancipate or remove from the state, a larger number of slaves than heretofore. As only the next generation of negroes would be entitled to emancipation, the law would not begin its practical operation for twenty-one years at least, and then it would operate gradually for thirty or forty years longer, before slavery would be extinguished in West Virginia. So that for many years the actual slave interest among us would not be greatly diminished.

"4. There is and long has been, in different parts of Virginia, every degree of difference, from the least to the greatest, between the slaveholding and the non-slaveholding interests of the people. In some parts, the slaves are two or three times as numerous as the whites, and the slaveholding interest overrules and absorbs every thing. In other parts, not one man in a hundred owns a slave, and the slaveholding interest is virtually nothing. In West Virginia at large, the slaves

being only one-eighth of the population, and the slaveholding population less than one-eighth of the whites, the free interest predominates nearly as much as the slave interest predominates in East Virginia: so that we have in practical operation, if not in perfection, that political incongruity of slave interest and free interest, which is feared as a consequence of the measure that we propose.

"5. By allowing West Virginia her just share of representation, and if she call for it, a law for the removal of slavery, East Virginia will do more to harmonize the feelings of the state, than she ever has done, or can do by a continued refusal. West Virginia being then secured in her essential rights and interests, will not desire a separation, nor be disposed to disturb the harmony of the commonwealth. So far from aiding the designs of the abolitionists, either in Congress or in our legislature, both her feelings and her interests will make her more than ever hostile to that pernicious sect.

"6. If East Virginia apprehend, that the delegates from the free counties would often speak more freely about slavery matters, than she would like to hear in her central city of Richmond; let her agree to remove the seat of government to Staunton, near the center of our territory and of our white population, and she will be free from all annoyance of this sort. West Virginia would then appear no more like a remote province of East Virginia, and be no longer subject to the disadvantage of having all measures affecting her interest, acted upon by a legislature deliberating in the heart of East Virginia, and exposed to the powerful influence of a city and a people, whose bland manners and engaging hospitalities, are enough to turn both the hearts and the heads of us rough mountaineers, whether we be legislators or not."—pp. 10, 11.

The remainder of the address is devoted mainly to the "facts and arguments which prove the expediency of abolishing slavery in West Virginia, by a gradual process, that shall not cause any inconvenience either to society in general or to slaveholders in particular." The outlines of this scheme, with the author's explanations, are thus given on pages 38—40.

"1. Let the farther importation of slaves into West Virginia be prohibited by law.

"The expediency of this measure is obvious.

"2. Let the exportation of slaves be free.

by permitted, as heretofore; but with this restriction, that children of slaves, born after a certain day, shall not be exported at all after they are five years old, nor those under that age, unless the slaves of the same negro family be exported with them.

"When the emancipation of the after-born children of slaves shall be decreed, many slaves will be exported, from various motives. The restriction is intended to prevent slaveholders from defeating the benevolent intentions of the law, by selling into slavery those entitled to freedom, and old enough to appreciate the privilege designed for them. Young children are allowed to be taken away with their parents and older brothers and sisters, but not to be sold off separately to evade the law.

"3. Let the existing generation of slaves remain in their present condition, but let their offspring, born after a certain day, be emancipated at an age not exceeding twenty-five years.

"By this measure slavery will be slowly but surely abolished, without detriment or inconvenience to slaveholders. \*\*

"If any man among us have many slaves and little or no land, he can easily profit by the law as well as others; let him sell negroes and buy land.

"Will any man argue, that the rights of slaveholders will be violated, because those rights extend to the offspring of their slaves?

"Now the slaveholder's right of property extends to the offspring of his slaves, so far as this, that when the offspring comes into existence, the law at present allows him to claim it as his. But when the law of the land shall in this particular be changed, his right is at an end; for it is founded solely on human law. By nature all men are free and equal; and human laws can suspend this law of nature, only so long as the public welfare requires it; that is, so long as more evil than good would result from emancipation. When the law of slavery is changed for the public good, all that the slaveholder can claim, is that in some way, he shall be compensated for the property acquired by sanction of law, and taken away by a change of the law. By our scheme nothing is absolutely taken from the slaveholder. It gives him an option, to remove without loss a nuisance which he holds in the country, or to submit, with a very small loss of value, to another mode of abating that nuisance. We say that the people have a right to remove this pest; and that our scheme gives slaveholders double compensation for what they will suffer by the measure. We have no doubt that before ten years, nearly every slaveholder would acknowledge himself doubly compensated.

"4. Let masters be required to have the heirs of emancipation taught reading, writing and arithmetic: and let churches and benevolent people attend to their religious instruction.—Thus an improved class of free negroes would be raised up. No objection could be made to their literary education, after emancipation was decreed.

"5. Let the emancipated be colonized.—This would be best for all parties. Susposing that by exportation, our slave population should in twenty-two years be reduced to 40,000. Then about 1000 would go out free the first year, and a gradually smaller number each successive year. The 1000 could furnish their own outfit, by laboring a year or two as hirelings; and their transportation to Liberia would cost the people of West Virginia 25,000 dollars: which, as population would by that time have probably reached a million, would be an average contribution of two and a half cents a head. This would be less and less every year.—So easy would it be to remove the bugaboo of a free-negro population, so often held up to deter us from emancipation. Easy would it be, though our calculations were not fully realized.

"Finally, in order to hasten the extinction of slavery, where the people desired it, in counties containing few slaves: the law might authorize the people of any county, by some very large majority, or by consent of a majority of the slaveholders, to decree the removal or emancipation of all the slaves of the county, within a certain term of years, seven, ten or fifteen, according to the number of slaves.

"This is an auxiliary measure, would be safe and salutary; because the only question then in a county, would be the question of time, which would not be very exciting. But it would be inexpedient as the chief or only measure; for then the people of the same county, or of neighboring counties, might be kept embroiled on the subject for years, and the influence of East Virginia, operating on counties here and there, might defeat the whole measure, by a repeal of the law. Let us move as a body first, and determine the main point. Then the counties might decide the minor point for themselves. Let West Virginia determine to be free on a general principle. Then let the counties, if they will, modify this principle, for more speedy relief."—pp. 38-40.

We shall refer to this scheme, with some remarks on several of the most important points, before we close. The reader's attention is first invited to a synopsis of the

"facts and arguments," by which Dr. R. demonstrates the expediency of abolishing slavery in West Virginia. Waiving all theoretical or abstract arguments, and all reference to past ages, he grounds his conclusions upon facts furnished by the history of our own age and country.

"No where," says he, "since time began, have the two systems of slave labor and free labor, been subjected to so fair and so decisive a trial of their effects on public prosperity, as in these United States. Here the two systems have worked side by side for ages, under such equal circumstances both political and physical, and with such ample time and opportunity for each to work out its proper effects,—that all must admit the experiment to be now complete, and the result decisive. No man of common sense, who has observed this result, can doubt for a moment, that the system of free labor promotes the growth and prosperity of states, in a much higher degree than the system of slave labor. In the first settlement of a country, when labor is scarce and dear, slavery may give a temporary impulse to improvement: but even this is not the case, except in warm climates, and where free men are scarce and either sickly or lazy: and when we have said this, we have said all that experience in the United States warrants us to say, in favor of the policy of employing slave labor.

"It is the common remark of all who have traveled through the United States, that the free states and the slave states, exhibit a striking contrast in their appearance. In the older free states are seen all the tokens of prosperity:—a dense and increasing population;—thriving villages, towns and cities;—a neat and productive agriculture, growing manufactures and active commerce.

"In the older parts of the slave states,—with a few local exceptions,—are seen, on the contrary, too evident signs of stagnation or of positive decay,—a sparse population,—a slovenly cultivation spread over vast fields, that are wearing out, among others already worn out and desolate;—villages and towns, 'few and far between,' rarely growing, often decaying, sometimes mere remnants of what they were, sometimes deserted ruins, haunted only by owls;—generally no manufactures, nor even trades, except the indispensable few;—commerce and navigation abandoned, as far as possible, to the people of the free states;—and generally, instead of the stir and bustle of industry, a dull and dreamy stillness, broken,

if broken at all, only by the wordy brawl of politics.

"But we depend not on general statements of this sort, however unquestionable their truth may be. We shall present you with statistical facts, drawn from public documents of the highest authority. We shall compare slave states with free states, in general and in particular, and in so many points of view, that you can not mistake in forming your judgment of their comparative prosperity."—  
PP. 11, 12.

This comparison between the prosperity of the free states and that of the slave states, is exhibited in respect to population, agriculture, manufactures, commerce, navigation, and popular education;—and we need not inform our readers, that the comparison exhibits a contrast of the most marked and convincing character.

In respect to population, he shows that the free states have gained greatly upon the slave states taken as a whole; but he contends that the comparison ought to be confined to the old states, where only the full effects of the two systems have had time for development.

"We will therefore," he says, "take the old free states, and compare them with the old slave states of Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia, in which slave labor predominates.

"New England and the middle states of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, contained in 1790, 1,968,000 inhabitants, and in 1840, 6,760,000; having gained in this period, 243 per cent.

"The four old slave states had in 1790, a population of 1,473,000; and in 1840, of 3,279,000, having gained, in the same period, 122 per cent., just about half as much in proportion, as the free states. They ought to have gained about twice as much; for they had at first only seven inhabitants to the square mile, when the free states not only had upwards of twelve, but on the whole much inferior advantages of soil and climate. Even cold, barren New England, though more than twice as thickly peopled, grew in population at a faster rate than these old slave states.

"About half the territory of these old slave states is new country, and has comparatively few slaves. On this part the increase of population has chiefly taken place. On the old slave-labored lowlands, a singular phenomenon has ap-

ed: there, within the bounds of these rapidly growing United States,—yes, there, population has been long at a stand; yes, over wide regions—especially in Virginia—it has declined, and a new wilderness is gaining upon the cultivated land! What has done this work of desolation? Not war, nor pestilence; not oppression of rulers, civil or ecclesiastical;—but *slavery*, a curse more destructive in its effects than any of them. It were hard to find, in old king-ridden, priest-ridden, overtaxed, Europe, so large a country, where within twenty years past, such a growing poverty and desolation have appeared.

"It is in the last period of ten years, from 1830 to 1840, that this consuming plague of slavery has shown its worst effects in the old southern states. Including the increase in their newly settled, and western counties, they gained in population only  $\frac{7}{4}$  per cent.; while cold, barren, thickly peopled New England, gained 15, and the old middle states, 26 per cent. East Virginia actually fell off 26,000 in population; and with the exception of Richmond and one or two other towns, her population continues to decline. Old Virginia was the first to sow this land of ours with slavery; she is also the first to reap the full harvest of destruction. Her lowland neighbors of Maryland and the Carolinas, were not far behind at the *seeding*; nor are they far behind at the ingathering of desolation. Most sorry are we for this fallen condition of 'The Old Dominion,' and of her neighbors: but such being the fact, we state it, as an argument and a warning to our West Virginia. It demonstrates the ruinous effects of slavery upon the countries in which the longest and most complete trial of it has been made."—p. 14.

"But, seriously, fellow citizens, we esteem it a sad, a humiliating fact, which should penetrate the heart of every Virginian, that from the year 1790 to this time, Virginia has lost more people by emigration, than all the old free states together. Up to 1840, when the last census was taken, she had lost more by nearly 300,000. She has sent—or we should rather say, she has driven from her soil—at least one-third of all the emigrants, who have gone from the old states to the new. More than another third have gone from the other old slave states. Many of these multitudes, who have left the slave states, have shunned the regions of slavery, and settled in the free countries of the West. These were generally industrious and enterprising white men, who found by sad experience, that a country of slaves was not a country for them. It is a truth, a certain truth, that *slavery drives free laborers—farmers, mechanics, and all, and*

*some of the best of them too—out of the country, and fills their places with negroes.*

"What is it but slavery that makes Marylanders, Carolinians, and especially old Virginians and new Virginians—fly their country at such a rate? Some go because they dislike slavery and desire to get away from it: others, because they have gloomy forebodings of what is to befall the slave states, and wish to leave their families in a country of happier prospects: others, because they can not get profitable employment among slaveholders: others, industrious and high-spirited working men, will not stay in a country where slavery degrades the working man: others go because they see that their country, for some reason, does not prosper, and that other countries, not far off, are prospering, and will afford better hopes of prosperity to themselves: others, a numerous class, who are slaveholders and can not live without slaves, finding that they can not live longer with them on their worn out soils, go to seek better lands and more profitable crops, where slave labor may yet for a while enable them and their children to live.

"But you know well, fellow citizens, that this perpetual drain of our population, does not arise from a failure of natural resources for living in Virginia. How could it, while so much good soil is yet a wilderness, and so much old soil could be fertilized; and while such resources for manufactures and commerce lie neglected?

"Had Virginia retained her natural increase, or received as many emigrants as she sent away, from the year 1790 to the present time, she would now have had three times her actual population; and, had all been free men, each laboring voluntarily, and for his own benefit, all richly gifted territory.

"The true cause of this unexampled emigration is, that no branch of industry flourishes, or can flourish among us, so long as slavery is established by law, and the labor of the country is done chiefly by men, who can gain nothing by assiduity, by skill, or by economy. All the older slaveholding states have proved this by sad experience."—pp. 16, 17.

He next presents a comparative view of the agriculture, the manufactures, and the commerce of the old free states, and the old slave states, especially Virginia.

Speaking of the results of agriculture, he says that in New England, the annual product is about \$180 to the hand, that is, for each person employed. In the middle

states of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, the average is about \$270 to the hand. In the old slave states, the average is about \$130 to the hand. Thus it appears that the free labor of the middle states, produces more than twice as much value to the hand, as the slave labor of the old slave states.

"Agriculture," he adds, "in the slave states may be characterized in general by two epithets—*extensive—exhaustive*—which in all agricultural countries forebode two things—*impoverishment—depopulation*. The general system of slaveholding farmers and planters, in all times and places, has been, and now is, and ever will be, to cultivate much land, badly, for present gain—in short, to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. They can not do otherwise with laborers who work by compulsion, for the benefit only of their masters; and whose sole interest in the master is, to do as little and to consume as much as possible."

"Agriculture can not flourish among us, because slave labor is unproductive, and keeps down the population,—also because it prevents the growth of manufactures, and thereby deprives our farmers of a home market, the most valuable of all;—also because it disables the country to construct railroads and canals, to facilitate trade and travel; and finally, we may add, because it destroys the spirit of industry and enterprise in the white population, and thus prevents them from doing what is yet in their power to do for the improvement of the country.

"Thus it comes to pass that lower Virginia with stores of fertilizing marl on her extensive shores, still goes on to impoverish probably ten times as much land as she fertilizes; that the valley, though full of limestone and fertile subsoil, is on the whole becoming more exhausted by a too wide-spread and shallow cultivation;—and that West Virginia, in general,—to mention but one of many particulars,—still leaves unoccupied the cheapest and the best sheep-walks in the United States, and confines her husbandry to a few old staple products; while New York and Vermont, in their snowy climate, gain millions of dollars annually by sheep-husbandry.

"In 1840, Vermont had 160 sheep to the square mile, and New York, in her northern districts, nearly as many: whilst Virginia had only 20 to the square mile, —few of them fine-wooled sheep, and these few chiefly on her northern border, near free Pennsylvania.

"No doubt sheep could be kept among our mountains, at one-third of what they

cost in those cold northern countries, where they must be stabled and fed during the five snowy months.

"Suppose that the mountains of Virginia were as well stocked with improved breeds of sheep as those north countries; they would now be pastured by six millions of those useful animals; whose yearly product of wool and lambs would be worth seven or eight millions of dollars; and the keeping of them would furnish profitable occupation for 12,000 families of free citizens. Then how changed would be the scene! Our desolate mountains enlivened with flocks; and the thousand now silent nooks and dells, vocal with the songs of liberty, —'The Mountain Nymph, sweet Liberty!'—Why is it not so in our mountains? —They who keep slaves can not keep sheep. The occupation requires care; but what do slaves care? Poor wretches! what should make them care?

"A few significant facts will conclude this sketch of our slave-system of agriculture. The towns and cities of lower Virginia are supplied with a great part of their hay, butter, potatoes, and other vegetables, not from the farms of Virginia, but from those of the free states. And even our great pastoral valley imports cheese in large quantities from the North."—pp. 20, 22, 23.

The following pregnant remarks may be taken as a specimen of the manner in which he exposes the inferiority of the slave states, in respect to manufactures:

"It matters not to our argument, whether a high tariff or a low tariff be thought best for the country. Whatever aid the tariff may give to manufactures, it gives the same in all parts of the United States. Under the protective tariffs formerly enacted, manufactures have grown rapidly in the free states; but no tariff has been able to push a slaveholding state into this important line of industry. Under the present revenue tariff, manufactures still grow in the North; and the old South, as might be expected, exhibits no movement, except the customary one of emigration. We hear indeed, once in a while, a loud report in Southern newspapers, that "The South is waking up," because some new cotton mill, or other manufacturing establishment, has been erected in a slave state: a sure sign that in the slave states an event of this sort is extraordinary. In the free states it is so ordinary, as to excite little attention.

"Even the common mechanical trades do not flourish in a slave state. Some mechanical operations must, indeed, be performed in every civilized country; but the general rule in the South is, to

import from abroad every fabricated thing that can be carried in ships, such as household furniture, boats, boards, laths, carts, ploughs, axes and axe-helves, besides innumerable other things, which free communities are accustomed to make for themselves. What is most wonderful, is, that the forests and iron-mines of the South supply, in great part, the materials out of which these things are made. The northern freemen come with their ships, carry home the timber and pig-iron, work them up, supply their own wants with a part, and then sell the rest at a good profit in the southern markets.—Now, although mechanics, by setting up their shops in the South, could save all these freights and profits; yet so it is, that northern mechanics will not settle in the South, and the southern mechanics are undersold by their northern competitors.

“Now connect with these wonderful facts another fact, and the mystery is solved. The number of mechanics in different parts of the South, is in the inverse ratio of the number of slaves: or in other words, where the slaves form the largest proportion of the inhabitants, there the mechanics and manufacturers form the least. In those parts only where the slaves are comparatively few, are many mechanics and artificers to be found; but even in these parts they do not flourish, as the same useful class of men flourish in the free states. Even in our valley of Virginia, remote from the sea, many of our mechanics can hardly stand against northern competition. This can be attributed only to slavery, which paralyzes our energies, disperses our population, and keeps us few and poor, in spite of the bountiful gifts of nature, with which a benign Providence has endowed our country.

“Of all the states in this Union, not one has on the whole such various and abundant resources for manufacturing, as our own Virginia, both East and West. Only think of her vast forests of timber, her mountains of iron, her regions of stone coal, her valleys of limestone and marble, her fountains of salt, her immense sheep-walks for wool, her vicinity to the cotton fields, her innumerable waterfalls, her bays, harbors and rivers for circulating products on every side:—in short every material and every convenience necessary for manufacturing industry.

“Above all, think of Richmond, nature’s chosen site for the greatest manufacturing city in America—her beds of coal and iron, just at hand—her incomparable water-power—her tide water navigation, conducting sea vessels from the foot of her falls,—and above them her fine canal to the mountains, through which lie the shortest routes from the eastern tides to the great rivers of the West and the South

West. Think also that this Richmond in old Virginia, ‘the mother of states,’ has enjoyed these unparalleled advantages ever since the United States became a nation;—and then think again, that this same Richmond, the metropolis of all Virginia, has fewer manufactures than a third rate New England town;—fewer—not than the new city of Lowell, which is beyond all comparison,—but fewer than the obscure place called Fall River, among the barren hills of Massachusetts:—and then fellow citizens, what will you think,—what *must* you think—of the cause of this strange phenomenon? Or, to enlarge the scope of the question: What must you think has caused Virginians in general to neglect their superlative advantages for manufacturing industry?—to disregard the evident suggestions of nature, pointing out to them this fruitful source of population, wealth and comfort?

“Say not that this state of things is chargeable to the *apathy* of Virginians. That is nothing to the purpose, for it does not go to the bottom of the subject. What causes the apathy? That is the question. Some imagine that they give a good reason when (leaving out the apathy) they say, that Virginians are devoted exclusively to agriculture. But why should they be, when their agriculture is failing them, and they are flying by tens of thousands from their worn out fields to distant countries? Necessity, we are told by these reasoners, drives the New Englanders from agriculture in their barren country, to trade and manufactures. So it did: Necessity drives all mankind to labors and shifts for a living. Has necessity, the mother of invention, ever driven Virginians to trade and manufactures? No; but it drives them in multitudes from their native country. They can not be driven to commerce and manufactures. What is the reason of that? If a genial climate and a once-fertile soil wedded them to agriculture, they should have wedded them also to their native land. Yet when agriculture fails them at home, rather than let mines, and coal beds, and waterfalls, and timber-forests, and the finest tide rivers and harbors in America, allure them to manufactures and commerce, they will take their negroes and emigrate a thousand miles. This remarkable fact, that they will quit their country rather than their ruinous system of agriculture, proves that their institution of slavery disqualifies them to pursue any occupation, except their same ruinous system of agriculture. We admit that some few individuals should be excepted from this conclusion: but these few being excepted, we have given you the conclusion of the whole matter; and as Lorenzo Dow used to say—you can not deny it.”—pp. 22-23.

For the purpose of satisfying the most incredulous of the immense deficiency of the slave states, in this branch of industry, he gives a comparative view of the iron manufacture, from the census of 1840, and divides the total value of the several states by their population, and finds the average for each individual. In three New England states, the average is \$45 a head; in New York, \$9; in New Jersey, \$16; in Pennsylvania, \$9; in Maryland, \$7½; and in Virginia, \$2½. And he thinks the result of the comparison would not be materially different, if the calculation were founded on all the various kinds of manufacture.

In respect to commerce and navigation, he shows by abundant statistics, that the slave states are relatively more deficient in these branches of industry, than in manufactures. This fact he sets in a strong light, by showing the surpassing natural advantages of Virginia.

"We may say," he observes, "that her bay and tide-rivers will make one great haven, 500 miles long, situated midway between the northern and southern extremes of our Atlantic coast. Norfolk is the natural centre of the foreign and coasting trade of the United States. It ought to have commanded the trade of North Carolina, of all the countries upon the waters of the Chesapeake, and of half the Great West. It ought to have been the second, if not the first, commercial city in the United States.

"Norfolk is an ancient borough, and once stood in the first rank of American seaports. But its trade declined, its population was long at a stand, and nothing but the public Navy Yard has kept it up. Meanwhile, northern towns have grown up to cities, and northern cities to great and wealthy emporiums: until our Virginia seaport, once their equal, would cut a poor figure among their suburbs. \*\*\*

"This sketch of the natural advantages of Norfolk, compared with its condition, is a good index of the commercial history of Virginia. In fact the commerce of our old slave-eaten commonwealth, has decayed and dwindled away to a mere pittance in the general mass of American trade.

"The value of her exports, which twenty-five or thirty years ago, averaged four or five millions of dollars a year, shrunk by 1842, to 2,820,000 dollars, and by 1846, to 2,100,000 dollars.

"Her imports from foreign countries, were, in the year 1765, valued at upwards of 4,000,000 of dollars: in 1791, they had sunk to 2½ millions; in 1821, they had fallen to a little over one million; in 1827, they had come down to about half this sum; and in 1843, to the half of this again, or about one quarter of a million; and here they have stood ever since,—at next to nothing.

"So our great Virginia, with all her natural facilities for trade, brings to her ports about one five-hundredth part of the goods, wares and merchandize, imported into the United States. \*\*\*

"As to ship building, Virginia, that ought, with her eminent advantages for the business, to build as many ships as any state in the Union, does less at it than the least of those free states. All that she builds in a year on her long forest-girt shores, would carry only eight or nine hundred tons—that is, about as much as one good packet ship at the North. Maine and Massachusetts build thirty-five times as much; little Rhode Island builds twice as much; New York twenty times as much; Pennsylvania twelve times as much; and Maryland seven times as much; and what would astonish us, if we did not know so many like facts, is, that much of the ship timber used in the North, is actually carried in ships from our southern forests, where it might rot before southern men would use it for any such purpose. We do not blame our southern people for abstaining from all employments of this kind. What could they do? Set their negroes to building ships? Who ever imagined such an absurdity? But could they not hire white men to do such things? No: for in the first place, southern white men have no skill in such matters; and in the second place, northern workmen can not be hired in the South, without receiving a heavy premium for working in a slave state."—pp. 27, 28, 29.

Passing from a view of the influence of slavery in depressing industry, Dr. Ruffner shows its influence upon popular education to be equally disastrous. It appears from the census that the number of adults who can not read, compared with the whole adult population, is, in New England, as one to one hundred and seventy; in New York, as one to fifty-three; in New Jersey, as one to fifty-five; in Pennsylvania, as one to forty-nine; in Maryland, as one to twenty-five; in Virginia, as one to five and a half; in North Carolina, as one to four and

a half; and in South Carolina, as one to five and a half.

The children who attend school in New England and New York are one to every four and a half white persons; in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, one to every nine; in Maryland, one to every nineteen; in Virginia one to every twenty-one; and in the Carolinas, one to every twenty-seven.

These facts "show beyond any manner of doubt, that slavery exerts a most pernicious influence on the cause of education. This it does by keeping the white population thinly scattered and poor, and making the poorer part of them generally indifferent about the education of their children."

Dr. Ruffner lays down three propositions by way of appendix to his general argument, to show the necessity of immediate action, to deliver West Virginia from the growing evils of slavery.

We shall gratify our readers by republishing this part of his pamphlet, without abridgment.

"1. *Comparatively few slaves in a country, especially one like ours, may do it immense injury.*

"This has been already proved; but we wish to impress it on your minds. We shall, therefore, explain by examples, how a few slaves in a country may do its citizens more immediate injury, than a large number.

"When a white family own fifty or one hundred slaves, they can, so long as their land produces well, afford to be indolent and expensive in their habits; for though each slave yield only a small profit, yet each member of the family has ten or fifteen of these black work-animals to toil for his support. It is not until the fields grow old, and the crops grow short, and the negroes and the overseer take nearly all, that the day of ruin can be no longer postponed. If the family be not very indolent and very expensive, this inevitable day may not come before the third generation. But the ruin of small slaveholders, is often accomplished in a single life-time.

"When a white family own five or ten slaves, they can not afford to be indolent and expensive in their habits; for one black drudge can not support one white gentleman or lady. Yet, because they

are slaveholders, this family will feel some aspirations for a life of easy gentility; and because field work and kitchen work are negroes' work, the young gentlemen will dislike to go with the negroes in dirty field work, and the young ladies will dislike to join the black sluts in any sort of household labor.—Such unthrifty sentiments are the natural consequence of introducing slaves among the families of a country; especially negro slaves. They infallibly grow and spread, creating among the white families a distaste for all servile labor, and a desire to procure slaves who may take all drudgery off their hands. Thus general industry gives way by degrees to indolent relaxation, false notions of dignity and refinement, and a taste for fashionable luxuries. Then debts stily accumulate. The result is, that many families are compelled by their embarrassments to sell off and leave the country. Many who are unable to buy slaves, leave it also, because they feel degraded, and can not prosper where slavery exists. Citizens of the Valley! Is it not so? Is not this the chief reason why your beautiful country does not prosper like the northern valleys.

"2. *Slavery naturally tends to increase from small beginnings, until the slaves out-number the whites, and the country is ruined.*

"How this comes to pass, is partly explained in the preceding remarks.

"The tendency of a slave population to gain upon the whites, may be counteracted by local causes, permanent or temporary. One permanent cause in the vicinity of a free state; a temporary cause occurred ten or twelve years ago, when the high price of negroes in the South, caused many to be sold out of our valley. The tendency is stronger also in a planting country, than it is in a farming or grazing country; yet so strong is the tendency itself, that it overcomes this check in West Virginia; for with the temporary exception just alluded to, the slave population has been steadily gaining on the white, in all parts except the vicinity of the free states.

"We have examined the census of counties for the last thirty or forty years, in Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina, with the view to discover the law of population in the northern slave states. The following are among the general results.

"When a county had at first comparatively few slaves, the slave population—except near the free borders—gained upon the whites, and most rapidly in older parts of the country.

"The population, as a whole, increased so long as the slaves were fewer than the whites, but more slowly as the numbers approached to equality. In our valley, a smaller proportion of slaves had the effect

of a larger one in East Virginia, to retard the increase of population.

" When the slaves became as numerous as the whites in the Eastern and older parts of the country, population came to a stand; when they outnumbered the whites, it declined. Consequently, the slave population has tended to diffuse itself equally over the country, rising more rapidly as it was farther below the white population, and going down when it had risen above them.

" Such were the general results. Exceptions occurred, but all general rules of this nature have their exceptions. This is nevertheless the law of population in a slave state.

" 4. *The price of cotton will probably decline more and more, and consequently the value of slaves: then also the law of slave increase, by which it gains on the white population, will operate in West Virginia with ruinous effect, unless prevented by law.*

" The price of cotton has regulated the price of negroes in Virginia; and so it must continue to do; because slave labor is unprofitable here, and nothing keeps up the price of slaves but their value as a marketable commodity in the South. Eastern negroes and western cattle are alike in this, that, if the market abroad go down or be closed,—both sorts of animals, the horned and the woolly-headed, become a worthless drug at home. The fact is, that our eastern brethren must send off, on any terms, the increase of their slaves, because their impoverished country can not sustain even its present stock of negroes. We join not the English and American abolition cry about "slave-breeding," in East Virginia, as if it were a chosen occupation, and therefore a reproachful one. It is no such thing, but a case of dire necessity, and many a heartache does it cost the good people there. But behold in the East the doleful consequences of letting slavery grow up to an oppressive and heart-sickening burden upon a community! Cast it off, West Virginians, whilst yet you have the power; for if you let it descend unbroken to your children, it will have grown to a mountain of misery upon their heads.

" We have the following reasons to apprehend, that unless prevented by law, the slave population will in a few years increase rapidly in West Virginia.

" 1. The price of cotton must fall, and with it the value of slaves.

" From fifteen to twenty years ago, the average price of cotton was eleven cents a pound; in the last five years between seven and eight cents. Had the last crop been a full one, the average would have been under seven cents. Every successive full crop now depresses

the price lower and lower; showing that the supply is on the whole outrunning the demand. It must outrun the demand, while the southern slave-market is open to northern slaveholders.

" From 1820 to 1830, the slaves in the cotton growing states (south of Tennessee and North Carolina) increased fifty-one per cent., and in the next ten years they increased fifty-four per cent. In 1840 the number including those in Texas was about 1,300,000. The number increases as fast as ever; for to the natural increase of the southern stock, is added the increase of the Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina negroes, and half the increase of those in Kentucky and Tennessee. Thus the negro population of the cotton states, is going on to double itself in a period of sixteen or eighteen years.

" Now the production of cotton must increase at the same rate as the slave population; for cotton and sugar are the only crops in which the slaves can be profitably employed; and the production of sugar can not increase faster than that of cotton. There will be no stoppage for want of good land: Texas has enough to produce ten times the quantity of the present annual crop.

" But the consumption of cotton can not increase at the same rate. The population of the countries that consume our cotton, does not double itself in less than sixty years: how then can they double their consumption in eighteen years, or even twice that period? Therefore the price of cotton must fall, and the southern demand for Virginia negroes must cease.

" 2. Good policy will require the southern states, ere long, to close their markets against northern negroes. The natural increase of their present stock of slaves, will increase the production of cotton as fast as the market will bear. Their short crops have always brought them more money than their full crops; showing that it is their interest to restrict the quantity within certain limits. A small excess in the quantity causes a ruinous fall in the price. Suppose the average profit to planters to be now two cents to the pound; then a fall of one cent takes away half the profit and half the value of their slave labor; and a fall of two cents would ruin the business. Good reason, therefore, had Mr. Bruce to apprehend, that the southern slave market might, ere long, be closed; and to urge Virginians to hasten the removal of their negroes to the south.

" But whether it be closed or not, one thing is evident,—that the value of slaves in the market must decline more and more. What then?

" 3. When the southern slave market is closed, or when, by the reduced profits of slave labor in the South, it becomes

glutted;—then the stream of Virginia negroes, heretofore pouring down upon the South, will be thrown back upon the State, and like a river dammed up, must spread itself over the whole territory of the commonwealth. The head spring in East Virginia can not contain itself; it must find vent: it will shed its black streams through every gap of the Blue Ridge and pour over the Allegany, till it is checked by abolitionism on the borders. But even abolitionism can not finally stop it. Abolitionism itself will tolerate slavery, when slaveholders grow sick and tired of it.

“In plain terms, fellow citizens, eastern slaveholders will come with their multitudes of slaves to settle upon the fresh lands of West Virginia. Eastern slaves will be sent by thousands for a market in West Virginia. Every valley will echo with the cry ‘Negroes! Negroes for sale! Dog cheap! Dog cheap!’ And because they are dog cheap, many of our people will buy them. We have shown how slavery has prepared the people for this: how a little slavery makes way for more, and how the law of slave-increase operates to fill up every part of the country to the same level with slaves.

“And then fellow citizens, when you have suffered your country to be filled with negro slaves instead of white freemen; when its population shall be as motley as Joseph’s coat of many colors, —as ring-streaked and speckled as father Jacob’s flock was in Padan Aram; —what will the white basis of representation avail you, if you obtain it? Whether you obtain it or not, East Virginia will have triumphed; or rather *slavery* will have triumphed, and all Virginia will have become a land of darkness and of the shadow of death.

“Then by a forbearance which has no merit, and a supineness which has no excuse, you will have given to your children for their inheritance, this lovely land blackened with a negro population—the offshoots of Eastern Virginia,—the fag-end of slavery—the loathsome dregs of that cup of abomination, which has already sickened to death the eastern half of our commonwealth.

“Delay not then, we beseech you, to raise a barrier against this Stygian inundation,—to stand at the Blue Ridge, and with sovereign energy say to this Black Sea of misery, ‘Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther.’”—pp. 34-38.

We can not but regard this Address to the citizens of West Virginia as one of the signs of the times, a sure prognostic of the near approach of the abolition of negro slavery in this country. The estab-

lishment of several weekly papers in the slaveholding states, devoted to the cause of emancipation, and the frequent discussion of the subject in the lyceums of the South, in their Legislatures, and in Congress, foreshadow, with equal distinctness, the speedy overthrow of the “peculiar institution,” at least in some of the states, and its ultimate extinction throughout the land. Discussion is fatal to the existence of slavery. It melted away before the light of truth in Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; and it will no more bear the light in Virginia, or in any state, where the character of the institution is made a matter of serious inquiry.

This pamphlet is worthy of attention not only as a conclusive argument in proof of the impolicy of slavery, but for the strong terms in which the institution is denounced. We should have rejected a contribution to our pages, from one of our own contributors, in which slavery should have been spoken of in the same rough style, as in bad taste, and calculated, by its severity, to incense those whom we desire to conciliate. He calls the institution that “cup of abomination which has already sickened to death the Eastern half of our commonwealth”—“a Stygian inundation”—“a Black Sea of misery”—“a mountain of misery”—“a consuming plague.” Speaking of the impoverishment of Virginia, he says: “For our part, we are grieved and mortified to think of the lean and haggard condition of our venerable mother. Her black children have sucked her so dry, that now for a long time past, she has not milk enough for her offspring, either black or white.” In answer to the question, what has done this work of desolation, he says: “Not war nor pestilence, not oppression of rulers, civil or ecclesiastical;—but *slavery*, a curse more destructive in its effects than any of them. It were hard to find, in old king-

ridden, priest-ridden, overtaxed Europe, so large a country, where, within twenty years past, such a growing poverty and desolation have appeared." "England still prospers with more than 250 inhabitants to the square mile; Virginia languishes with only 20, though she is by nature almost as richly endowed as England. Massachusetts thrives with 100 inhabitants to the square mile; Virginia, considering her natural advantages, ought to thrive as well with a much larger number; and so she would if she had the same quality of men on her soil." Speaking of the large emigration from Virginia, constantly going on, he says: "The land has already got slave-sick, and is spewing out its inhabitants. What a pity that so rich and lovely a land should be afflicted with this *yellow fever* and *black vomit*." The reason why northern farmers go farther and pay more (for land), instead of buying and cultivating the better and cheaper land of Virginia, he declares to be, that they justly look upon all Virginia as an *infected country*. In the possible event of slavery's overrunning West Virginia, he says that the whole state will become "a land of darkness and of the shadow of death." We do not think it necessary to speak of slavery in severer terms of condemnation. An institution which is acknowledged by those who know it best to be adverse to all the interests of a people—tending, by an inevitable law, to general poverty and barbarism—has no sanction from the Governor of the world. We care not, for our own conviction, to consult his statute book—the Bible. What is so plainly a doctrine of natural religion needs no confirmation from the Scriptures; but, as in all similar cases, we should expect to find it there, not in formal assertion, but, like the divine existence itself, every where assumed. We appeal to our author, as a doctor in the church, if it is not absurd to look into the word of God for a

sanction to a system of servitude, which, by a natural law, that no wisdom can frustrate, brings poverty, idleness, and ignorance, with "the yellow fever and black vomit," upon the community in which it exists. How do we know that polygamy, gambling, gladiatorial shows, the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, are contrary to the law of God?—How, but by the manifest evil tendency of such practices? Yet all these evils combined can do but a small part of the injury which is inflicted upon society by the sole influence of slavery as it exists in Virginia. All these evils, polygamy, gambling, gladiatorial games, intemperance, existed in the palmiest days of Grecian art and Roman prowess. The Republics of Greece and the empire of Rome were brought to ruin, not by Paganism, and not by popular vice, but by slavery. Ignorance and vice are terrible scourges to nations—but far less terrible than a system of servitude which requires one half of the inhabitants to labor for the other without hope of reward. Such a system bears the most indubitable marks of immorality. Why then appeal to the example of Abraham in evidence of its lawfulness? What natural religion teaches to be wrong, is wrong, whatever may have been the practice of the Hebrew patriarchs, or the civil institutions of Moses. As well might the polygamist plead patriarchal example in defense of his conduct; or the gambler assert his innocence on the ground of the silence of the Scriptures respecting games of chance. Nature itself teaches us, without room for doubt, that indecency of conversation or manners is reprehensible; and, with equal certainty and distinctness, that any institution or practice which tends infallibly to corrupt, enfeeble, impoverish, and barbarize a people, is indefensible. Such is slavery according to the repeated assertions of Dr. Ruffner—more destructive in its influence than

war or pestilence, or oppression, civil or ecclesiastical.

We do not find in this pamphlet the slightest reference to the moral character of slavery—not an intimation that it ought to be abolished for reasons of morality, of justice, or of religion—not an allusion to the fact, as well established as any other, that Christian institutions can not flourish in a slaveholding state. We are at a loss to account for so grave an omission. Is it because this “master in Israel” is blind or indifferent to this most serious aspect of the subject? or is it because he thinks it expedient to employ the economical argument apart from the higher considerations of morality as likely to be the most influential with his fellow-citizens? We would hope that an appeal to conscience on the ground that the holding of slaves is an offense against the law of God, would not be without effect in West Virginia. We are happy in believing that there are thousands of conscientious persons possessing political power in that state, and very many slaveholders, with whom such an appeal would be even more influential than the considerations so ably urged by Dr. Ruffner. The propriety and importance of showing the pernicious influence of slavery upon the population, the industry, and the educational interests of the state, we do not question. But it is a fact, honorable to human nature, that the considerations of duty are, with all but reprobates, even more decisive than those of interest. The conviction once fastened on the popular mind that it is wrong to hold men in slavery—that the law of God condemns the practice—would be immediately followed by measures of emancipation. The great desideratum at the South is an enlightened public conscience. And never was there in West Virginia a more favorable opportunity than the present, for the dissemination among the people of just views of the moral rela-

tions of the subject. Convinced that slavery is adverse to their temporal interests, they would not be blinded by selfishness to the force of an argument, from the light of nature as well as from the Scriptures, showing that the institution is unlawful. The moment that this conviction is produced, other principles of the mind besides a sense of duty, come into play in favor of freedom—as, for instance, the love of reputation. A feeling of shame is awakened by a conviction of guilt. Mankind do not feel disgraced by pursuing a business which proves to be merely unprofitable—but if it is found, in their own apprehension and in that of others, to be dishonest, they are at once overwhelmed with confusion. They feel that a good name is more precious than rubies, and are led to sacrifice their interests to the love of reputation. On every account, therefore, it behoves the friends of freedom in West Virginia, to bring the moral argument before their fellow-citizens. This is the more necessary, because it is the only argument that can have weight with that portion of the people whose personal interest it is to maintain the obnoxious institution. Some are slaveholders; others are expecting to inherit slaves; others hold mortgages on slaves, or are the creditors of slaveholders; others are profitably engaged in the traffic. All these are drawn by their personal interests into the support of slavery, regardless of the evils which the institution inflicts on society at large. They can be reached only through conscience and a love of reputation. A sense of duty, or a sense of shame, may effect that which appeals to interest in their case would have no tendency to accomplish. We, therefore, question the practical wisdom of President Ruffner, if he does not intend to bring the moral argument against slavery, to strengthen the economical argument, and thus to insure the success of his laudable undertaking.

It is a noble work which he has undertaken—one which can not fail, if successful, to raise Western Virginia, in a few years, to the high state of prosperity which our author admires in the old free states. In climate, soil, and mineral wealth, Virginia, west of the Blue Ridge, surpasses any equal extent of territory in New England—indeed, it is larger than Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, united. We, therefore, earnestly desire that the friends of freedom in Virginia may place before their fellow-citizens the proofs of the repugnance of slavery to the principles of reciprocity, to the law of marriage, to the duties of parent and child, to the rights of conscience, to all social obligations, to that free exercise of our powers in the pursuit of happiness which is the birthright of all, without distinction of color, and notwithstanding any human laws to the contrary. In this way, by enlightening the public conscience and bringing all good men to execrate the system of slavery, not only as impolitic, but as unjust, they may accomplish their end more speedily than will be possible under a sense of mere prudential considerations. We have also another reason for this desire, in the belief that the abolition of slavery will be effected on a plan more or less humane and benign, according to the view which is taken of its moral character. If slavery shall be abolished simply from motives of public policy, the welfare of the emancipated slave will be little regarded. But if the measure shall be taken as an act of justice to the slave, his interest will be consulted in the manner of executing it.

In regard to the scheme for the removal of slavery proposed by Dr. R., we have several things to say on several distinct features of the plan.

The scheme contemplates the abolition of slavery in West Virginia only, leaving the institution untouched east of the Blue Ridge. This,

Dr. R. considers a practicable measure, and a reasonable demand on the part of the West. We have, however, no expectation that this will ever be conceded by East Virginia. The conflict of interests between the two divisions of the state is the same, which has, on a larger scale, distracted the councils, embarrassed the legislation, and threatened the stability of our federal government—growing out of the irreconcilable diversity and opposition between the interests of free and slave labor. No system of legislation can be framed which shall foster both equally, or protect one without oppressing the other. The moment, therefore, that West Virginia shall obtain the majority in the Legislature, East Virginia will find her peculiar interests unsafe. Favors to slavery will then be meted out in the same stinted measure with which the East has hitherto meted to the internal improvements of the West. This the East will not bear, so long as she is opposed to the abolition of slavery throughout the entire state. If she is as wise as her celebrity for statesmanship authorizes us to believe, she will allow West Virginia to be erected into a separate state, rather than concede to her the right of prohibiting slavery west of the Blue Ridge, and of establishing the white basis of representation for the whole state. The moment it is seen that the political power of the state is about to pass out of her hands, she will think her own side of the mountain quite extensive enough for “the mother of Presidents.” We are, hence, of the opinion that West Virginia will not become free territory while she continues a part of the state of Virginia, unless it be by a general act extending to the whole commonwealth. What prospect there is of a transfer of the balance of power in 1850, from the east to the west side of the mountain, we do not pretend to say, but Dr. Ruffner seems to expect the change at that

time. In that event, West Virginia will be able to dictate her own terms to the East, and the East will in vain oppose the removal of slavery. Her course in that juncture will depend on the degree of tenacity with which she will then hold on to the institution. If it shall have ceased to be profitable, she will join with the West in an act of general abolition; but if a market for her slaves is still open, she will probably prefer a division of the state to the removal of slavery, even from West Virginia. We feel quite certain that she will never give her voluntary consent to a law for the abolition of slavery in any part of her territory, until she is prepared to banish the evil from the whole state.

It is manifest not only from particular expressions, but from the whole course of his argument, that Dr. Ruffner considers slavery to be a greater curse to East Virginia than to the West—as much greater as the number of her slaves exceeds that of the West. And most of the reasons which he gives in proof of the policy of removing slavery from West Virginia, apply with equal or superior force to the policy of the East. He declares expressly, that if it were not for the market abroad, the slaves of the East would be “a worthless drug,” and that their impoverished country can not sustain the increase or even the “present stock of negroes.” He is also of the opinion, that the policy of the new slave states will, at no remote day, close the door against the importation of any more slaves, and that then the ruin of Virginia will be completed. These considerations seem to us sufficiently decisive of the true policy of East as well as of West Virginia. The catastrophe of a general bankruptcy can not long be averted, except by the adoption of measures for the removal of slavery from the state. To this the friends of freedom on both sides of the Blue Ridge should address themselves—demanding a

law for the abolition of slavery in the whole state—and diffusing information on the subject by the press and in every practicable way. We should like to see another argument from the pen of Dr. Ruffner, equally able with this, and addressed to the citizens of East Virginia: showing the madness of postponing to a future day the abolition of slavery—and the happy consequences of immediate action.

The scheme of Dr. R. proposes the gradual extinction of slavery by the emancipation of those only who shall be born after a certain day. All who shall be born previous to that date, with the existing generation of slaves, are to remain in bondage for life. This is the principal feature of the plan and one which deserves our serious consideration. Any scheme which insures the extinction of slavery, though at a day ever so distant, is to be hailed as better than perpetual bondage. It was on a plan substantially like that proposed by Dr. R. that several of our states were delivered from the institution of slavery. We rejoice in the result, however much we may regret that a system of emancipation more accordant with humanity, justice, and the soundest public policy, had not been preferred. We rejoice at this movement in West Virginia; and wish success to the undertaking. Yet we think we can show, to the satisfaction of unprejudiced minds, the preferableness of immediate emancipation, extending to the whole slave population. What advantage is it expected will be gained by Dr. Ruffner's scheme? We will first reply to this question, and then exhibit the superior advantages of our own plan.

Dr. R. evidently aims at “saving the rights and interests of the slave-holders;” and his scheme has the merit of effectually providing against any pecuniary sacrifice, not voluntarily incurred. The owners are permitted to sell their slaves, and

even to export the freeborn children under five years of age, provided the slaves of the same negro family are exported with them. These freeborn children who are not exported before the age of five years, owe service to their masters until they reach an age not exceeding twenty-five years. Their labor during this period will defray the expense of raising them, with enough at a fair estimate of wages, to pay their market value. The master therefore receives a fair equivalent for his slave, even if his absurd claim of property in the unborn offspring of his slaves, be admitted. This scheme commends itself on this account to the selfishness of the slaveholder. He can not hear with patience of a project of immediate emancipation, which shall strip him at a blow of the ownership of his slaves. But this arises, as we suppose, out of a narrow view of the subject. Immediate emancipation would in fact enrich Virginia in a short period, beyond the present market value of all her slaves. The rise in the value of land and other property; the impulse given to all kinds of productive industry; the influx of population and capital; would very soon place a country of such peculiar natural advantages in the first rank. The proprietors of the soil would be especially benefited. A slaveholder who now realizes an annual income from his plantation, above the expenses of cultivation, of one thousand dollars, would be made no poorer by emancipating his slaves and employing them on wages, as free laborers, if his net income were no less; and he would be richer, if the income were augmented. His plantation would then command as high a price in market, without the stock of slaves, as it now commands with the slaves upon it. And the demand would be much brisker from the fact, that young men of enterprise from the north would come into the

market as purchasers. This they would undoubtedly do if slavery were wholly abolished, because that would place them upon an equal footing with all other citizens. Their political influence, their social privileges, and their command of labor, would be the same as the native inhabitants themselves enjoy. No system of gradual emancipation can offer the same inducements to buy real estate and settle in Virginia. Slavery would still remain. Free labor would still be disreputable, and have still to compete in the market with unpaid toil. Northern men would be reluctant to face the grim visage of slavery, for a generation to come, and to suffer for that period the evils inseparable from its existence. This is a consideration of great importance in determining the effect of emancipation upon the value of real estate in Virginia. There is no other state in the union, to which there would be an equal rush of population, the moment slavery should be abolished.

There is only one class of slaveholders whose pecuniary interest would suffer by an act of immediate emancipation—and that class is probably not numerous—embracing those who own but little or no land. A rise of value in the soil would not accrue to their benefit, and they might suffer a total loss of the market value of their slaves. Most of them, however, have 'other' and more legitimate property on which to depend, or they are capable of self-support by some lucrative employment; and in the worst case, the act of emancipation would enrich the poor slaves to the extent in which it would impoverish their masters. On the whole, therefore, humanity would gain by this act of public justice and of general policy. The community at large would be benefitted to a degree surpassing incomparably the misfortunes of the few. But in our apprehension, the act of emancipation should provide

at the common expense for the relief of those who can show that the measure falls with unequal severity upon them, or that it leaves them without other means of support. The state can afford to make a liberal provision for extreme cases. A debt created by so beneficial a measure, would soon be liquidated by the consequent increase of the public revenue.

There is for the same reason some ground of argument in favor of an appropriation by the federal government, for the relief of this class of slaveholders in any state where slavery may be abolished. The measure would be beneficial to the whole country, and not to the emancipating state alone. The moment the slaves become their own masters, they will become customers, buying as fast as they can earn the means, the manufactures of the free states, to ornament their persons and cabins, and to promote their comfort and convenience. It would not be many years before every negro family would want the farming implements, the culinary utensils, the time-pieces, and the cotton fabrics of New England. It is a great annual loss to the North that the laborers of the South are consumers of the products of her industry only to a very trifling extent. Emancipation would open in the space of a few years, we have no doubt, a most important market for our manufactures. Nor is this the only advantage which would accrue to us. The measure would save the country from all the hazards and expenses of a servile war; would render us invincible by foreign powers; and would so harmonize the interests of the states, that the legislation of the general government would be less fluctuating. We should more easily agree upon the permanent policy of the country, and the bitterness of party strife would be less likely to distract our councils. Emancipation

would also open the business of the South to the enterprising young men of the free states. Slavery excludes them from several of the most lucrative branches of industry — the cotton, sugar, and rice cultivation. Were slavery abolished throughout the country, many northern men would buy the new lands of the southwest and of Texas, and employ the emancipated slaves in these branches of agriculture. Others would resort to the "old dominion," and soon her hills would be covered with flocks, and her worn out plantations smile in all the luxuriance of the valley of the Connecticut. We speak of the advantage to our own sons, inseparably connected with the abolition of slavery, by opening to them these new fields of enterprise; but the advantage to the South herself from this accession of population can not be overlooked. While the South would gain most by the measure, the North would be immensely benefitted, and for this benefit we acknowledge her obligation to pay an equivalent, by sharing in the burden of emancipation.

We do not, however, regard the refusal of the general government to make appropriations to this object, as a valid reason for the continued existence of slavery. The several states in which it exists can well afford to assume the whole burden of indemnity for private losses. Several of our states have already abolished slavery within their own jurisdiction, without any aid from the national treasury. Equality requires that the other slave states should do so too. And if emancipation can not be effected at once, without affecting injuriously the interests of a small minority, it would be unreasonable to forego on that account a measure of such vast and palpable public interest. It is seldom that fundamental changes can be made in society, without incidental evils; yet this fact should

not be allowed to put a stop to public improvements.

We claim that immediate emancipation is a measure of precisely this character. However heavy the pecuniary loss attending it, there are advantages to be secured for which a far greater sacrifice might reasonably be made; and these advantages would accrue to every class of persons without distinction.

It is important to the general interest, that the system of emancipation should satisfy the reasonable expectations of all classes, and make it the interest of all to maintain public order and tranquillity. The scheme of Dr. R. would exasperate the discontent of the existing body of slaves. The man born yesterday, will see no reason why he should be enslaved for life, while another born to-day, is educated and trained to be free at the age of twenty-five. Nor would he cheerfully submit to such a distinction. His discontent would endanger the security and peace of society. A whole generation of slaves would not consent to die off quietly with no struggle to be free. All that idleness, negligence, waste and theft can do to injure the masters, would be done. An expensive police would be required to restrain them from crime, and to prevent their escaping into the free states. No efficient measures of mental and moral improvement, even in respect to the children to be emancipated, could be put into operation. Instead of a simple code of laws for the government and protection of a homogeneous people, a most complex system of legislation would be required, for the different classes—the enslaved and the free.

Now contrast this state of things with the security and peace, the industry and thrift, the moral and intellectual improvement, consequent upon an act of immediate emancipation. With the emancipated people, the day of freedom is a day of

rejoicing; of praise to God; of gratitude to men. The following account of the manner in which the 1st of August, 1838, was observed in the British West Indies, may convey some idea of the emotions of a people just emerging from slavery into freedom.\*

In this way the day of freedom opens. Henceforth he who was a

\* The day itself, when it came, was celebrated by the freed people in the most becoming manner. In Barbados, it was set apart by proclamation of the Governor, "as a day of devout thanksgiving and praise to Almighty God for the happy termination of slavery. The Governor himself attended divine service in the cathedral, an immense building, which was crowded in every part of its spacious area, galleries and aisles, with a most attentive assemblage of people of all colors and conditions. Several clergymen officiated; and one of them, at the opening of the services, read most appropriately the fifty-eighth chapter of Isaiah. Imagine for a moment the effect in such an audience, on such an occasion, where were many hundreds of emancipated slaves, of words like these:—‘Is not this the fast that I have chosen, to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?’ The sermon by the bishop was, as might have been expected on such an occasion, interesting and impressive. He spoke with great effect of the unexpected progress of freedom, from island to island, from colony to colony, until, with a solitary exception, upon that day the stain of slavery was obliterated forever from every British possession. The progress of education, the gradual reformation of morals, and the increasing thirst for religious instruction, were all dwelt upon with great force, and the glory of all ascribed as was most fit, to the great Giver of every good and perfect gift.”

“The close of the day was not less auspicious. Nothing was seen that could mar the decent and truly impressive solemnity of the day. There were no dances, no merry-making of any sort; not a solitary drunkard, nor a gun fired, nor even was a shout heard to welcome in the new-born liberty. The only groups we saw were going to or returning from the different chapels and churches; except in a few instances, where families might be seen reading or singing hymns at their own dwellings.”—W. R. Hayes, Esq., in *Thome and Kimball's Tour*, pp. 8, 9.

slave is a freeman; a proprietor, a husband, a father, a member of society. His time, his labor, his skill, his wife, his children, are his own; and he has an interest therefore in the maintenance of law, order and public tranquillity. He appropriates a portion of his earnings to the education of his children, to the support of his superannuated parents, and to the maintenance of public worship. Depending as he does upon his good behavior, carefulness and industry, for employment, and for the rate of compensation, he strives to accomplish the greatest possible amount of labor, and to promote the interests of his employer. The lands which grew barren under a forced cultivation, now recover their fertility. The master, relieved from the support of the sick, the maimed and the superannuated, and losing nothing by the wastefulness of his servants, and nothing by death and desertion, and paying nothing for overseers, receives a larger income from his estate than under the old system. He has less care, less trouble in the management of his affairs, and is a richer man than he was when he owned a hundred slaves. These considerations seem to us to be conclusive. There never was but one serious objection to immediate emancipation, namely, the danger to which it was supposed it would expose the peace of society and the lives and property of the masters. That objection has been effectually silenced by the success of emancipation in the British colonies; and we are now only surprised, that it should ever have been imagined, that the removal of all cause of discontent, and the gift of freedom to a people eminently capable of gratitude, could be otherwise than safe.

There is another feature of Dr. Ruffner's scheme, which will, we think, be remembered in future times, as one of the errors of this age. "Let the emancipated," he

says, "be colonized." He makes a calculation to show how easy it would be to carry this proposal into execution, so far as West Virginia is concerned, and thus "remove the bugaboo of a free negro population, so often held up to deter us from emancipation." The Doctor will perhaps be surprised to learn, that what he calls a "bugaboo," a new word to us, we consider the veriest bugbear. A free colored population may be a very valuable population. The contrary opinion owes its origin to slavery itself, in connection with which a free colored population is an evil, both because it can hardly fail to be an idle, ignorant and vicious population, and because it may infect the slaves with discontent, and aid their efforts to recover their liberty. But where there are no slaves, free people of color may live without detriment to any interest of society, and contribute their full share to the common wealth and convenience. This opinion is supported by the experience of New England. There are, it is true, among her colored inhabitants, worthless and vicious persons; but not a greater proportion, perhaps, than of the whites. The mass of them are industrious, intelligent and honest; and in those states where they are permitted to vote, their political influence has occasioned no evil. We are not disposed to require of foreigners a long residence in our country, before they may be admitted to the privileges of citizens, but we consider the colored population of the north much more competent to exercise political rights, than the great body of recent immigrants. And if we were citizens of Virginia, we should much rather employ emancipated slaves upon our plantations, than introduce the degraded operatives of Europe. What then is the object of colonization? We have nothing to say against the republic of Liberia. We believe it is destined to become a

great nation, extending, by a series of purchases and conquests, over a large part of the continent. But what advantage is Virginia to reap by expatriating the laboring class of her population, or any part of them? Would she be made by the measure either richer or stronger? Would her income be greater, or her taxes less? The very reverse. Her colored population, by whose labor she lives, would still, if free, be the producers of her wealth; and as they would all be subject to a poll tax, for the support of government, and to taxes upon any property which they might accumulate, the present rate of taxation would be diminished. Virginia would therefore inflict an injury upon herself, if she were to carry out this part of Dr. Rutherford's scheme. She would thereby incur the expense of exporting to Liberia a population which she would afterwards be glad to import. The abolition of slavery would create a demand for labor, which could not be easily supplied; and instead of wishing to expatriate her colored people, the South would offer high wages to tempt emigration from the north. This demand would increase as the emancipated became landholders or mechanics, and withdrew from the service of their masters to attend to their private business. This has been precisely the course of things in the British West Indies, into which the planters have sought to introduce laborers from abroad. Every good, trustworthy and able-bodied man whom Virginia may send off, she will, after slavery is no more, wish to recover. We think we can promise Dr. R., that in the event of the abolition of slavery in his state, the demand for labor in East Virginia will empty West Virginia of the mass of her colored people, who, attracted by high wages, and by a natural desire to congregate with their own color, will voluntarily emigrate. The same effect will be felt in the northern states,

upon the general abolition of slavery. Many will emigrate to the south for the reasons just given; and not a few, to be school-teachers and preachers of the Gospel.

We predict that in that day which succeeds the abolition of slavery, there will be no constitutional or legislative prohibitions of immigration from any country or race. Every new laborer will be regarded, not as a nuisance, but as an addition to the productive power of the state. Population will be allowed to regulate itself, like articles of commerce, by the wants of the market, increasing or diminishing with the demand for labor and the means of subsistence. The surplus population of a state will pass without force or friction, to supply the deficiency of labor in other quarters. We need not say, that the true and established policy of that day, ought now to be admitted as a matter of principle. This country is manifestly designed by Providence to be the refuge of the oppressed of all lands. We who first occupy it, would be guilty of barbarity, were we to throw any barriers in the way of fugitives to our shores. This land is God's city of refuge for the world, and wo be to him who closes the gate against any of the unfortunate who would flee into it. Equally barbarous are the laws which would prohibit the people of color from passing from one state into another. These laws are also in open conflict with that article of the federal constitution, which secures to the citizens of each state the rights of a citizen in all the states. The colored citizens of New England have a constitutional right to emigrate to Illinois, and make their home there, in spite of the constitution of that state. But if this right were not secured to them, it would still be theirs, on the broad principle, that no man shall be hindered in the pursuit of happiness so long as he respects the rights of others. This principle ap-

tities the foreigner to a refuge and home among us; much more are they entitled to a part in the country, who are native Americans. We can therefore concede neither the policy nor the right of Virginia, or of any other state, to remove her free colored population from their native soil, either by actual or constructive force.

#### CHRONOLOGY.\*

We had hoped that any notice, which Dr. Jarvis might take of our article on chronology in the *New Englander* for October last, would be of such a character, as to make it unnecessary to proceed further in exposing his errors. Controversy is so little to our liking, that we should willingly have rested under no common load of misapprehension and even of misrepresentation, rather than have renewed a discussion which we are aware with some of our readers, perhaps with many, can have little or no interest. It was supposed, that what we had already said, would furnish abundant materials to repel any ordinary or even extraordinary attack, which might be made on our positions; and that if any one should find himself perplexed in consequence of what should be subsequently written on any topic which had come under review, a recurrence to what we had already published would remove his doubts. But the course which the displeasure of an author will lead him to take, can not be easily foreseen; and the event, in the present instance, has proved our anticipations to be groundless. In the first number of the *Church Review*, a periodical which began its literary life in April of the present year, Dr. Jarvis has commented on our second article in a manner which we never imagined possible; and has pursued a course of reasoning, to meet which, it is acknowledged,

we had made for our readers no adequate provision. That a production like that to which we refer, should have been sent from the press, we consider a remarkable phenomenon in the republic of letters; and our readers, we hope, will excuse us for attempting to bring into full light its errors and its fallacies. In doing this, however, we shall study brevity; but aim at the same time to be so full and explicit, as to make what we have to say, in the language of some of the old books of instruction, "plain to the meanest capacities."

Without further preface we come directly to Dr. Jarvis's strictures. These are addressed to the reviewer personally. On page 94 we find the following passage:—

"Elated by what you supposed to be an irreconcilable difference between Victorius and Bianchini, you have triumphantly uttered the following truism:—'Now as we see no good reason to doubt that the interval between the new and full moon in A. D. 28 was the same as in other years, (!) and are fully convinced that 14 added to 14 is 28 and not 26, the two computations can not stand together.' (N. E. p. 538.) This may be the arithmetic of Yale College now; but in my days there, if 14 was the first, we should have added 13 to find the fourteenth day of the moon; and if 13 was the first, then 13 added to 13 is 26 and not 28."—*Review*, p. 94.

Here, with all proper deference to the learned chronologer, we shall make an attempt to correct his Exercise. The proposition "that the interval between the new and full-moon in March, A. D. 28, was the same as in other years," is not a logical truism; nor is this one, "that 14 added to 14 is 28 and not

\* Dr. Jarvis's Vindication. *Church Review* for April, 1848.

26;" unless the multiplication table is a tissue of truisms, and unless every dictionary is made up of nothing better. Dr. Jarvis has here mistaken *equality* for *identity*. But, be it so, that "14 added to 14 is 28 and not 26," is a truism; yet Dr. Jarvis maintains, if we understand him, that, in the case under consideration, it is not *true*. He says, that at Yale College "in my days there, if 14 was the first, we should have added 13 to find the 14th day of the moon." Here we say without hesitation, that if at Yale College he had added numbers in this way to find the "day of the moon," he would have been checked immediately by his instructor, and his mistake would have been pointed out. To see how utterly nonsensical this method of calculation is, the reader is requested to look at it for a moment. What, then, is meant by the "day of the moon?" If these words mean anything, it must be the *age* of the moon; and this is the sense in which they are employed by astronomers. The 3d "day of the moon" is the 3d day after the moon has passed its conjunction with the sun, and the 10th "day of the moon" is the 10th day after it has passed the same point; and similar language is used for any day till the moon reaches its conjunction again. Dr. Jarvis himself uses the phrase, "day of the moon," in the same sense. In his Introduction, (p. 432,) we read, "the 14th day of the moon—would fall—on the 25th of March." Here he must mean the 14th day after the change of the moon. But he says, in the passage just quoted, "if 14 was the first, we should have added 13 to find the 14th day of the moon." If by the expression "14 was the first," he means, what he should seem to mean, that the 14th day of the month is the day on which the new moon occurs, then why add 13 to find the "day of the moon?" If by 13, he means that the moon is

18 days old, then why any addition whatever? He has the "day of the moon" already. If he does, or does not, mean this, adding 13 or any other number to 14 as above, is making not the least approximation towards ascertaining the "day of the moon." If the 14th day of the month is the day of new moon, and the moon is afterwards 18 days old, then 13 added to 14 will give 27, the day of the month, when the moon is 18 days old. If the moon is 14 days old, then 14 added to 14 as before, will give 28, the day of the month when the moon is 14 days old; nor can it possibly be otherwise. As to adding 13, when the moon is 14 days old, to find the day of the month when it is of this age, which possibly is what Dr. Jarvis is aiming at,—it is an absurdity;—for when the moon is 14 days old, it is 14 days old—a *truism* and *true*; and 14 days should be added. Dr. Jarvis seems to be laboring under a strange hallucination respecting the distinction between *cardinal* and *ordinal* numbers. Our recommendation, therefore, is, that he take back as incorrigible the whole of the passage under examination; that he rewrite it, and express his meaning in more intelligible language. We feel that it is here necessary to apologize to our readers for dwelling so particularly on what they may justly think obvious at a glance; but it should be recollected by those disposed to complain, that Dr. Jarvis appears to have unaccountably lost the mathematical and astronomical knowledge acquired by him in his collegiate days. For his special benefit, therefore, we are obliged to be extremely elementary in our statements.

We now come to the consideration of the time of new and full moon in March, A. D. 28. It will be recollected by our readers that Dr. Jarvis supposes the Crucifixion to have taken place in this year; which opinion he undertakes to confirm

from two sources, historical and astronomical. It is the testimony of antiquity, he says, that Christ suffered on the cross in the consulship of the two Gemini; which consulship he places in A. D. 28, one year, however, earlier than it has been placed by most, if not by all, of the older writers, who have been looked to as standards in chronological science. In this same year, according to the Canon of Victorius, an authority to which he pays great deference, the new-moon in March was the 11th day, and the mean full-moon on the 25th, and the true full-moon on the 26th of the same month. The 26th day was Friday, the day before the Jewish sabbath, and the day of the week on which, according to the evangelical history, Christ was crucified. This time of new and full-moon he supposes to be in some way confirmed by the calculations of Bianchini, an Italian astronomer. From these considerations he maintains, that the true time of the Crucifixion is established beyond reasonable doubt.

Here we would premise, that in questioning this conclusion, we have no object but to ascertain historical truth. The point of inquiry is purely literary, and has nothing about it of a theological character. Whichever way it should be decided, the story of the Crucifixion as told in the four Gospels remains the same; and the mode of determining the time of Easter, and of the other movable feasts, is undisturbed. It can interfere not at all, as we believe, with any man's religious faith or practice. It would have been to us a literary gratification, to be satisfied of the soundness of Dr. Jarvis's reasoning; but as we are not satisfied, it has seemed neither unkind, uncivil, nor inexpedient to point out, what we think its fallacy.

By the Canon of Victorius, as we learn from Dr. Jarvis,\* the Pas-

chal new-moon in March, A. D. 28, was on the 11th day. We learn from him likewise,\* that according to Bianchini, by the mean motions of the sun and moon, the Paschal new-moon took place at Jerusalem, "the 14th of March, 3h. 17m. 10sec. P.M.; and that the time of true conjunction was eleven hours later;" that is, at 2h. 17m. 10sec. A. M., March 15th. Dr. Jarvis, as we have before observed, seems to have brought forward this astronomical calculation of Bianchini to confirm the correctness of the Canon of Victorius; but as there is a difference of about three days between the two, we ventured, in our last article, to represent them as irreconcileable. He now says, that there is here a "typographical error;" and that the mean conjunction of the sun and moon was on the 13th day of March, and the true conjunction on the 14th. This he undertakes to prove from other parts of Bianchini's statements. To us it appears a much more direct way of ascertaining whether there is here any error, to recalculate the time of the mean and true new-moon in question. Bianchini made use of the astronomical tables of De la Hire. By the modern tables the time of mean new-moon, March, A.D. 28, at Jerusalem, was the 14th day, 3h. 20m. 53sec. P. M., and the time of true new-moon, the 15th day, 1h. 47m. 41sec. A. M. The difference between the two sets of results is too small to be of any importance in the present discussion. The time, therefore, of mean and of true new-moon as stated by Bianchini, is sufficiently correct; and the supposition of a "typographical error" is groundless. From extracts, however, furnished by Dr. Jarvis from Bianchini, it would at first appear, that this astronomer has not been uniform in noting the time of this new-moon; but from an examina-

\* Introduction, p. 481.

\* Introduction, p. 488, note.

tion of these extracts, we strongly suspect, that if we could see his whole statement, we could show, that he is throughout consistent with himself. But it is not incumbent on us to defend Biaschini. Whether his meaning has been misapprehended or not, there can be no doubt, that in the time of mean and of true new-moon, as quoted above, he is near enough to the truth. If he has made anywhere else a very different representation, he is certainly in error. This is one of the cases, where a decision is arrived at by figures; and figures, when properly used, never deceive. We shall consider it, then, incontrovertible, that in March, A. D. 28, the mean new-moon at Jerusalem was on the 14th day in the afternoon, and that the true new-moon was on the 15th day in the morning, civil time.

We now come to the consideration of the full-moon of the same year and month. Here very few words would be necessary, were it not for the novel and extraordinary method adopted by Dr. Jarvis of calculating a lunar opposition. According to the modern tables, the time of mean full-moon, March, A. D. 28, at Jerusalem, was the 29th day, 9h. 42m. 54sec. A. M., and the time of true full-moon, the same day, 4h. 48m. 56sec. A. M., civil time. This differs about three days from the time of full-moon as determined by the Canon of Victorius, where it is placed on the 26th. Dr. Jarvis undertakes to show, that the 26th was the day of March, on which this Paschal full-moon really took place; which by mere *inspection*, is seen to be an attempt to accomplish an impossibility. From the 14th, the time of mean new-moon, to the 26th, is but twelve days; and a full-moon can not take place after a new-moon, with so short an interval. If it should be allowed, contrary to fact, that the new-moon, as Dr. Jarvis supposes, was on the 18th of the

month, this would make the interval but thirteen days, which is still too small. Dr. Jarvis himself in his Introduction, (p. 432,) speaks of the "ordinary method of computing each lunation as 29 $\frac{1}{2}$  days, or two lunations as 59 days;" and again he furnishes a table (p. 431) "constructed on the data" of Victorius, in which fourteen days are allowed between new and full-moon. Yet in the face of all this, he proceeds boldly to his work; and it may afford the reader some amusement to see the process by which he attains his object.

The mean time of the full-moon in question, is proved from the best sources, as we suppose, to have been the 29th day of the month in the morning. To bring this full-moon to the 26th day of the month, *three days* must be thrown out of the account. To effect this, Dr. Jarvis first assumes that there is a "typographical error" in Bianchini, and that the new-moon was on the 13th day. By this gratuitous supposition, one day is stricken from the list. This time of new-moon he sets down, according to astronomical notation, as 12d. 15h. 17m. 10sec.; that is, twelve complete days and a part of the thirteenth. To find the mean time of full-moon, he adds to the mean time of new-moon thus ascertained, half the mean time of the moon's "*periodical*" [sidereal] revolution round the earth; that is, 13d. 15h. 51m. 31 $\frac{1}{2}$ sec.; which has nothing to do with the subject. What he should have added is half of the moon's *synodical* revolution; that is, 14d. 18h. 22m. 2sec. Dr. Jarvis himself in his Introduction, (p. 459,) adopts "the common method of computing lunar months, as consisting alternately of twenty-nine and thirty days." But by taking the moon's *sidereal* revolution, which is just as obvious an error as it would be to add seventy-five cents to a dollar to make two dollars, he rids himself of a *second* day and

some more. Next he adds together the time of mean new-moon, as he understands it, and half of the mean time of the moon's *sidereal* revolution round the earth, and obtains the sum, 26d. 7h. 8m. 41 $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. But as both the *twelve* days and the *thirteen* days are *complete* days, the *twenty-six* days, according to one of the plainest mathematical principles, that the sum of two numbers is of the same denomination as the numbers added, should be reckoned as *complete* days also. But then the time, in civil reckoning, would be the 27th day; which is still too much. He, therefore, calls this 26, the 26th day, and a *third* day is cancelled. By this kind of legerdemain, in direct opposition to the clearest physical and mathematical truth, as well as his own admissions, the work is done. These three days, then, which have been cashiered without "rhyme or reason," should be restored to their proper place, which will bring Dr. Jarvis into entire agreement with ourselves, as to the time of this full-moon.

But strange as the above mode of finding the time of full-moon may appear, a subsequent remark by the author is perhaps still more so. "The responsibility," he says, "of these calculations rests not on me."<sup>\*</sup> If not on him, we would ask, on whom does it rest? We venture to say without hesitation or qualification, that these calculations are entirely *new*;—and if Dr. Jarvis will examine all the records of mathematical and astronomical science, from the time when the first man began to count, to the time when he himself calculated this full-moon, he can find nothing like them. This mode of calculation, he does not ascribe, as in the former case, to any thing taught him at Yale College; and this silence we believe just. From some knowledge we have of that institution, we give it as our opinion,

that any student there, who should perpetrate such an astronomical *extravaganza*, as we have just had under review, would be put immediately on an extra course of lessons; or what is more probable, his instructors, following the course of honest Apollonius of Alabanda, would earnestly advise him to pass at once to some employment for which he was better fitted.

One thing, we are sure, must be now clear,—that Dr. Jarvis's attempt to determine the year of the Crucifixion by calculating new and full-moons, is an absolute failure. The full-moon, A.D. 28, occurred March 29th, the second day of the week, one day after that which, according to the evangelists, was the day of the resurrection; of course the Crucifixion, if on the day of the full-moon, could not have been on the preceding Friday, as he maintains. We would here add, that the Rev. Henry Browne, a clergyman of the church of England, in his late work, entitled, *Ordo Saclorum*, which Dr. Jarvis speaks of with respect, calculates the time of full-moon, March, A.D. 28, as we have done,—and rejects this year as the year of the Crucifixion.\*

Dr. Jarvis, very properly, is careful to remind us often of our ignorance; of which, even without his friendly monitions, we are deeply sensible;—and one thing of which we acknowledge ourselves ignorant, is the mode in use among the Jews, of determining the time of lunar conjunctions and oppositions. For aught we know, they might have used for this purpose a cycle, which at some periods, differed several days in its results from the true times; or they might have depended on observation, or have allowed circumstances not now well ascertained, to interfere in some years with the time of the actual return of these phenomena; so that the true times

\* Review, p. 98.

\* Page 55.

might have been antedated or post-dated. Even if the learned Rabbis in the time of our Savior, had in their possession a set of rules for calculating the place of the moon with tolerable correctness, Dr. Jarvis ought not to deny, that they might have been mistaken several days in their computations; as he has himself been, with the modern improvements of astronomical science within his reach. If he is not certain how this matter was, his reasoning fails in another important point. On the supposition, that the Jews did not ascertain the conjunction and opposition of the sun and moon in correct astronomical time, even if he could show, as he can not, that it was full-moon, March 26th, A. D. 28, it would go but a little way towards proving, that this was the year of the Crucifixion. In his Introduction,\* he says, that the Jewish "writers maintain that they fixed the time of the new-moon only by its appearance." If this was so, the time of new-moon fixed by them in March, A. D. 28, must have been the 16th or 17th of the month, unless, which it may not be easy to show, they made some allowance,—as the new-moon is not visible till one or two days after the change. The time of full-moon would be proportionally later. In conclusion, then, of this part of the subject, we say,—that there is no proof that the full-moon, March, A. D. 28, was on the 26th day,—that there is the highest proof that the nature of the case admits of, that this full-moon was on the 29th day,—that Dr. Jarvis has no evidence whatever, that the Jews, in the time of our Savior, ascertained the conjunction and opposition of the sun and moon by astronomical calculation; and that if they were guided, as according to his own statement, Jewish writers alledged, by the moon's "appearance," the day which he has fixed up-

on for the paschal full-moon is probably still further removed from that on which he has placed it. It is the opinion of Gieseler,\* as we read in his valuable Manual of Ecclesiastical History, that in consequence of the uncertainty of the Jewish calendar, it is an impossibility to ascertain the Friday on which the crucifixion occurred; in which opinion we fully concur.

We should say nothing at present on the subject of Christmas, were it not that Dr. Jarvis has furnished in reference to it, a specimen of reasoning so peculiar, that it should not pass without comment. It is hardly less remarkable than his calculation of a full-moon. We had admitted, that the observance of the 25th of December as the day of the Nativity, existed very early in the church; and stated that we had no objection to what Wheatley has said respecting this day, in his work on the "Book of Common Prayer." But relying on the highest authorities in the Episcopal church, we gave it as our opinion, that the evidence that the Nativity was in fact on the 25th of December, is wholly insufficient. In the course of our remarks, we asked this question, and appended the obvious and unavoidable answer. "Is there any thing in the New Testament, either in the Evangelists, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles, or the Apocalypse, from which the exact time of the Nativity can be deduced? No."

"But," says Dr. Jarvis, "I think there is; and what is more, the ancient church thought so. The evangelist tell of Joseph and Mary's arrival in Bethlehem. St. Luke says that they went to be enrolled; and no sooner had they arrived, than the child Jesus was born, so that he also might be enrolled. The registers would show the date of his birth; and they were kept in Rome in the public archives, to which any one could have access. The church at Rome knew the day of his birth, and observed it. From these archives, the church catholic learned the true date, and the day became generally known, and as generally observed."†

Such bold sophistry as this is seldom met with. What is there in the language of Luke about the 25th of December? The most that Dr. Jarvis can claim is, that Luke does not say, that the 25th of December was *not* the day of the Nativity. Neither does he say that September was *not* the month of the Nativity, where Archbishop Ussher has placed it; nor does he say, that the 1st of October was *not* the day of the Nativity, which according to Archbishop Newcome, may be assumed as the day of this event; nor does he say, that any day of the year, where the Nativity has been placed by speculators on this subject, was *not* the true time. The language of Luke is equally consistent with all the opinions as to the day of the Nativity, so far as such opinions are known to us, which have ever been uttered. Any one of these opinions may be "deduced" from what Luke has said, as well as another. If it should be replied, that there is more external evidence in favor of the 25th of December, than of any other day; —then the *deduction*, that this is the true day, is from *that evidence*, and not from the narrative of Luke. As to the "registers" kept at Rome, we have yet seen no reason to believe, that any existed deserving of credit in a case like this. The testimony of St. Chrysostom is mere hearsay; and as to Tertullian,—what is his reputation for accuracy in matters of fact? Does Dr. Jarvis himself rely on what he says of the succession and reigns of the Roman emperors? Yet in this latter case, there were certainly the means of exact knowledge within the reach of this Father, of which he made, as Dr. Jarvis must admit, no proper use. It will be time enough to examine this subject further, when it is shown, that some one historian of established character for sound judgment in historical criticism, has thought the story of the "registers"

to be entitled to full credence. Till then we must leave it with the remarks in our preceding numbers.

Other discoveries are made by Dr. Jarvis in the Gospels. He says, "the evangelists tell of Joseph and Mary's arrival in Bethlehem." Which of the evangelists, except Luke, says any thing of this "arrival?" He adds—"St. Luke says that they went to be enrolled; and no sooner had they arrived, than the child Jesus was born, so that he also might be enrolled." But where has he learned this? All which appears from Luke is, that the child Jesus was born, while his parents "were there,"\* that is, in Bethlehem. For aught that is said by the evangelist, this birth might have occurred *after* the enrollment. That "the child Jesus was born, so that he also might be enrolled," is not said by Luke; he speaks only of the enrollment of Joseph and Mary. If the child Jesus was enrolled, this fact must be substantiated by some other authority. These are given as specimens of the general looseness and inaccuracy of Dr. Jarvis's statements. His pen at times seems to run entirely at random.

We had referred to the writings of the Apostolical Fathers, of Justin Martyr and of the younger Pliny as containing nothing on the subject of Christmas. This reference, Dr. Jarvis is pleased to denominate "purely ridiculous." But where are we to look for evidence, whether such a festival existed, if not in Christian authors, or in a heathen author like Pliny, when speaking of the early Christians and their observances? Would he send us to the writings of the Jews? But what superior claim have these as authorities on such a question? And if we are not to go to Christians, Heathen or Jews,—where are we to look for satisfactory information respecting the antiquities of the Christian

\* Chap. ii. 6.

church? Besides, these writers referred to, certainly are minute in their specifications, exhortations, and directions. The first day of the week is mentioned as the day of Christian assemblies; the mode of worship, and the existence of religious teachers, are alluded to, with greater or less particularity;—and what more natural, what more a matter of course, than that there should be some intimation in the same writers, of the observance of the great Festival of the Nativity, if practiced in their time? Their silence is highly significative. Dr. Jarvis ought rather, as we should judge from his common mode of reasoning, to infer that what he calls “the old leaven of Puritanism,” was “working” in some unaccountable way thus early; and that the Fathers of the primitive church were kept back from noticing Christmas, “because there was not chapter and verse in the New Testament which said, in so many words, that Christ was born on the 25th of December.” Dr. Jarvis, if he had lived, with his present opinions, in the first or second century, would surely not have been influenced by such narrow views; and we may safely conclude, that in any treatise of his on the church, he would not have been guilty, any more than now, of so strange an oversight as to say nothing of Christmas. Where, moreover, are we to look for the opinions and practices of any modern denomination of Christians, with greater assurance of arriving at the truth, than in the writings of their own authors, and of cotemporary authors not of their sect? and if these show nothing respecting some doctrine or observance, and contain no allusion to either;—is it not a plain, a necessary inference, that the doctrine or observance in question, probably does not exist in that church, and has not in the estimation of its members, any great prominence and importance? For Dr. Jar-

vis to object, therefore, to drawing, from the silence of early writers, any inference as to the probability of some observance or non-observance in the primitive church, is, to use his own language, “more than ridiculous;”—it is very much like trifling with the understanding of his readers. Will he in his forthcoming volume make no deductions in any case from the *silence* of the Fathers? We have before observed, that the Apostles were Jews;—and that the observance of birth-days was foreign to their manners. From this also we infer that the celebration of the 25th of December was not one of the earliest Christian institutions. As to distinguishing this day and other similar days by stated religious rites, we have said nothing against it. All which we have insisted on, is sanctioned by the highest authorities in the Episcopal church, and in other communions, where Christmas is celebrated.

We had asked another question to which we had likewise given an answer,—as follows. “Does St. Augustine, in his enumeration of the Christian Festivals of his time, make particular mention of Christmas? No.”—Dr. Jarvis does not controvert the correctness of our reply; but he insists upon what we never denied, that St. Augustine testifies fully to the 25th of December as the day of the Nativity, and that “there are extant thirteen of his sermons for that Festival.” But it was not our object to show, that St. Augustine was ignorant of Christmas. We had fully admitted, that this Festival “was very early observed in the primitive church,” and, of course, that it must have been known to him. In our first notice of Dr. Jarvis’s work, we alluded to St. Augustine’s catalogue, not as proof, that the author of it did not believe the Nativity to have been on the 25th of December, but as evidence, that Christmas was probably “more lately introduced,

and of lower estimation," than the Festivals which he mentioned. Having said this once, it was not thought necessary to repeat it. It was, then, incumbent on Dr. Jarvis in his reply, to assign some more probable reason than we had done of St. Augustine's omission, and not to accumulate proof of the Saint's *belief*, which, so far from questioning, we had, if not expressly, yet by necessary implication, admitted.

We now come to what Dr. Jarvis has said respecting the appearance of the moon, during Cæsar's expedition into Spain against the sons of Pompey. It will perhaps be recollected, that the passage in the commentary usually ascribed to Hirtius, on the Spanish war, about the meaning of which we differed from Dr. Jarvis, is the following: "Cæsar priusquam eodem est profectus, luna hora circiter vi visa est." That is,—"Before Cæsar departed for the same place, the moon was seen about the sixth hour." Dr. Jarvis claims, that the sixth hour here was midnight; and on this he founds an argument, that Cæsar's expedition was in the *year of confusion*, or the forty-sixth before the Christian era. In our last article on chronology, we represented the historian to mean, "that before Cæsar commenced his pursuit of Pompey, there occurred a *prodigy*,—that the moon was visible at the sixth hour; that is, when the sun was on the meridian." We stated in addition, that the moon, at the time referred to, "on the day after the retreat of Pompey, at twelve o'clock, would be above the horizon in the east; and if the state of the atmosphere was favorable, might be seen."

The notice by Dr. Jarvis of this explanation of the phenomenon, is of so peculiar a character, it being a compound of astronomical knowledge and wit in about equal quantities, that for the amusement of our readers, we quote it entire.

"Prodigious indeed! To those old Romans, the moon in first quarter and at the blazing noon of day, appeared *above the horizon in the east!* We, in these degenerate days, always see the new moon above the horizon in the *west*; and as the author says not one word about its being a *prodigy*, it must have been usual in Cæsar's time to see the new-moon in the *east!* 'Cela estoit autrefois ainsi; mais nous avons changé tout cela!'"

That the wit of this might be manifest to all readers, a note is appended marked editorial, as follows:

"The author here quotes from Molier's *Médecin malgré lui*, Act II, Sc. 6. As our readers may not have the works of the French dramatist at hand, we subjoin the dialogue to show the point of the quotation:—*Géronde*. There is only a single thing which startled me, and that is the position of the heart and the liver. It seems to me, that you place them differently from what they are; and that the heart is on the *left* side, and the liver on the *right* side. *Squenarelle*. Yes. That was so formerly; but we have changed all that, and we now practice medicine after an entirely new method."—ED."

We feel some misgivings at spoiling all this, both text and commentary, as it seems to have been considered by Dr. Jarvis one of his most happy efforts,—and is evidently a pet-passage in his vindication; but we see not but it must go the way of his other astronomical vagaries. "We always," he says, "see the new-moon above the horizon in the *west*." If by this he means, that we can see the new-moon in the *west*, when it is there, and not obscured by clouds,—he says what is true, what has never been denied,—but what is nothing to his purpose. If he means, that we see the new-moon in the *west*, and *no where else*,—this is begging the question. If he means, that the new-moon is *stationary* in the *west*,—he says what is not true. In this place we would premise, that we feel the necessity, as heretofore in our remarks on a question of astronomy, considering with whom we have to deal, of beginning with first principles. The moon, then, re-

volves in its orbit from *west* to *east*; and has an *apparent* revolution from *east* to *west*; and by this last revolution, it *rises* in the *east*, just as often as it *sets* in the *west*. If we see the new-moon in the *west* after sunset, it is because it is *east* of the *sun*; and if the *sun sets* first, it *rises* first; and if the moon is *east* of the *sun* at *sun-setting*, at any time before the full, it will be *east* of the *sun* at *sun-rising*,—and it will still be *east*, when the *sun* is on the meridian. The only question now is, whether in that part of the heavens, and at noon, the moon, a few days after conjunction in the month of March, “if the state of the atmosphere is favorable,” can be easily seen.

The worthy Bishop Wilkins, a writer of the seventeenth century, learned and ingenious, though perhaps rather more inclined to speculation than is fitting for his order, in his “Discourse tending to prove, that ‘is probable there may be another habitable World in the Moon,’”\* reports that Rabbi Simeon entertained a fancy which, if well founded, must be considered an important circumstance in the early history of that luminary. From this high authority, it appears that the moon, when young, was “ambitious,” and “much discontented” because in some important respects she was inferior to the *sun*; and she was “in great distress and grief for a long space; but that her sorrow might be in some way pacified, God bid her be of good cheer, because her privileges and charter should be greater than the *sun’s*; *he* should appear in the day-time only, *she* both in the *day* and *night*.” We have produced this precious fragment of lunar biography, to satisfy Dr. Jarvis that even in the day-time the moon may be seen, and thus possibly in the time and place specified. For ourselves we rely much more on proof of quite a different

kind. Soon after the publication of the Church Review in April, the moon being of just the same age as it is claimed to have been when referred to in the Commentary on the Spanish war, the reviewer requested several gentlemen well acquainted with astronomy, both theoretical and practical, to look with him *east* of the *sun* at noon. They did so; not that they had any doubt of the result, but were willing to see what they had seen before. It was the “blazing noon of day;” that is, there was not a cloud to be seen. The moon was distinctly visible in the *east*. A few minutes after, he requested one of the publishers of the Church Review to look towards the *east*. He too saw the new-moon in that part of the heavens. If Dr. Jarvis himself will take the proper time, and look in the right direction; that is, if keeping in mind that the heart is on the *left* side, he will turn his eye to the *east* and not to the *west*, he also may enjoy this spectacle.

We would here remark, that all seasons of the year are not equally favorable for this sight. March and April in our latitude, which differs not greatly from that where Caesar was in Spain, afford as good an opportunity for this purpose, as any other months. It will undoubtedly be remarked by the reader, that our language was, that on the day referred to in the commentary of Hirtius, the moon “at twelve o’clock would be above the horizon in the *east*; and if the state of the atmosphere was favorable, might be seen.” This last clause Dr. Jarvis has omitted in his quotation, though essential to our full meaning. In his own statement, he uses the phrase “blazing noon of day,”—as an equivalent; for reasons, which must be best known to himself. But it is true, that the moon may be clearly seen at the time and place mentioned, even when the *sun* is in full splendor; but with less distinct-

ness, than when the sun is wholly or partially obscured. It is a fact likewise, which may be viewed by Dr. Jarvis as incredible, that the moon in its last quarter may be often plainly seen *west* of the sun,—even at the “blazing noon of day.”

We add, that almost all historians, annalists, and chronologers, place this expedition of Cæsar in the first Julian year, or the year 45 before Christ. Petavius,\* when he wrote, supposed them to be unanimous on this point. Among these, we have in a former number mentioned particularly Calvisius and Archbishop Ussher. One of the ablest of modern chronologers is Clinton, late of the University of Oxford; and he, in his *Fasti*,† places this expedition in the same year. His other dates, as of the consulship of Cicero and of the death of Augustus, are the same which we have claimed, in our previous numbers, to be the true ones. Dr. Jarvis remarks,‡ that Clinton has “adopted the faulty arrangement of the Consular Chronology, probably from considering it as definitively settled.” That he thought this chronology “definitively settled,” is undoubtedly true; and it admits of as little doubt, that he came to this conclusion, on a careful and judicious examination of historical authorities. As evidence of the estimation in which this work is held by the learned in Europe, it may be mentioned, that one volume of it has already appeared in Germany in a Latin translation. This volume we have seen, and suppose that the others will be soon published. The commentators on the history of Cæsar’s war in Spain, have, most

of them, interpreted the disputed passage in the manner which we have adopted. They say, that the sixth hour here means, when the sun was on the meridian; that it was the day-time; and that the appearance of the moon is spoken of as a *prodigy*.\* If the expedition under consideration was in the forty-fifth year before our era, where it is placed on such full testimony, then the explanation of the lunar phenomenon, must be either that of Petavius, which we stated in our number for October last, or that which we have adopted as the more probable, and which has been generally considered by the learned as entirely satisfactory. We still, therefore, maintain that there is no astronomical reason arising from the place of the moon, why Cæsar’s expedition into Spain might not have been in the first Julian year. If we are wrong in this, we have the consolation in our error of being in very good company.

But Dr. Jarvis has undertaken, by a historical deduction, to establish his theory, that this expedition was in the previous year; that is, the forty-sixth before Christ.† In this part of his argument he goes into a long detail, from a minute examination of which we are relieved, at present, by meeting an obstacle, which, unless it shall be removed, will completely obstruct any further progress. All admit, that Cæsar on his return from Spain, appointed two consuls, one of whom died on the 31st of December; and that he

\* *Planum est, Hispaniense bellum anno primo Juliano gessisse Cæsarem; sic enim Historici omnes, et Fastorum Annaliumque Scriptores, nemine dissentiente, perhibent.*” *De Doctrin. Temp. tom. ii.* 146.

† *Vol. III. p. 204.*

‡ *Preface to Introduction, p. x.*

\* In the Elzevir edition of Cæsar of 1661, we read of this lunar phenomenon, —“*Prodigium fuisse sentiendum est; et unum ex iis cuiusmodi pleraque commemorat Dion, quibus imminentibus calamitatibus Pompeio pronuntiata est.*” In the Delphin edition—“*Hora meridiana, quod prodigii loco fuit.*” In the edition of Oudendorp—“*Hora, scilicet dies. Immerito id suspicunt est, etc. Luna interdiu adparuit.*” In Lemaire’s edition—“*Hora VI. Est ipsa meridies. Narratur ut prodigium.*”

† *Introduction, p. 175.*

appointed another to hold the consular office for the few hours which remained of the year. Now Cæsar, when he went to this Spanish war, is supposed to have left Rome some time before the first of January of that year in which the expedition is placed. This supposition rests on another, that if he did not leave Rome till the first of January, there might not have been time for accomplishing all, which seems to have been done before the month of March. Dr. Jarvis, therefore, maintains that Cæsar, in the first Julian year, must have been in Rome on the first of January—and consequently, that this could not have been the year of the Spanish campaign. But how does he prove this? By assuming, that Cæsar appointed a consul in Rome the day before. Undoubtedly, if this was so, it is true not only that Cæsar did not leave Rome before the first of January in the first Julian year, but that the Spanish expedition was already brought to a close. Why, then, proceed any further in the argument? If he has fixed the date of the short consulship, he has fixed the time of the expedition into Spain; for this was immediately before. But that he has determined the time of the short consulship to have been on the last day of the year forty-six before our era, we do not see. As the matter now stands, the whole appears to depend on a *petitio principii*, or *begging the question*;—or has not the author so stated facts as to have the appearance at least of placing the end of the year before the beginning, thus furnishing a striking example of the figure *hysteron proteron*? We must, therefore, leave this part of the argument, as in its present state too perplexed and unintelligible for our comprehension.

There is one more passage in the Vindication, which we copy for the entertainment, if not for the edification, of our readers.

"The Puritan views of ecclesiastical history are colored and distorted by their wretched Individualism. They never look at the concurrent testimony of the church. They never consider its catholic practice. They never regard the actions or reasonings of individuals as the exponents of the time and portion of the church in which they lived. They think, if they ever deign to think at all, of St. Hippolytus, St. Peter and St. Cyril of Alexandria, Victorius, Dionysius, St. Maximus, Bede, and all other ancient computists, as of solitary astronomers at the present day, pursuing abstract researches in their own closets, and not as men engaged for CHRIST's sake, in labors approved by the church, carried into practice by the church, and thus solemnly ratified by the church. With the exception of St. Hippolytus and St. Peter of Alexandria, the others mentioned lived after the Council of Nîmes. That august body had all the means which imperial power could give, to assist them in the great work of arranging the Christian calendar. Yet the subject was not thereby extricated from all its difficulties. If it had been, we should not have found the philosophic school of Alexandria engaged in the fifth century in adjusting the Cycle; nor should we have seen the deferential appointment of Victorius, by the heads of the Latin church, to apply the labors of the Alexandrian schools to the western calendar. As I was exhibiting the civil computation of time, known and acknowledged by the primitive church, my sole object in referring to the astronomical computations of De la Hire as copied by Bianchini, was to enable my scientific readers to see how far the civil and the astronomical agreed. If they did not agree, that would not prove that the civil computations in A. D. 28, were not as Victorius has represented them. Previous to A. D. 1582, the civil computations of the solar year, differed *ten days* from the astronomical. Did that prove, not that the civil computation was erroneous, but that it did not exist? Yet such is the force of your argument. 'The two computations,' you say, 'can not stand together,' therefore, Victorius, or rather the *early church*, told an untruth as to a plain matter of fact!"—*Review*, pp. 96, 97.

This passage suggests numerous topics of remark; but we have space and time to notice only a few of them. How far canonization is evidence of skill in astronomy, or what degree of authority ought to be allowed in this science to the decisions of individuals, who have re-

ceived this high ecclesiastical distinction, we will not undertake to determine. We can say only, that hitherto it has not been an article of our faith, that these saints and others, whom Dr. Jarvis has enumerated, or the church, or all united, whatever deference may be due to their opinions, either separately or conjointly, on other subjects, have been infallible in mathematics. As for St. Hippolytus, his cycle was adopted by the church, or a portion of it, but was soon found to be more erroneous than that which it displaced, and was consequently abandoned. What is the amount here of the "concurrent testimony?" Does St. Hippolytus testify to the infallibility of the church? or does the church testify to the infallibility of St. Hippolytus? Is it not, on the contrary, evident that both, in part at least, were wrong? This same saint is represented, as placing the crucifixion in A. D. 29. Dr. Jarvis places it in A. D. 28. Must not both be put down as having pursued "abstract researches in their own closets?" St. Hippolytus would probably so decide of Dr. Jarvis; and we see not but Dr. Jarvis should so decide of St. Hippolytus. In view of each other, neither could justly hold a higher rank, than that of a "solitary astronomer."

As to the "Council of Nice; that august body had all the means which imperial power could give, to assist them in the great work of arranging the Christian calendar," and yet, what did that imposing assembly thus aided and supported, accomplish in this matter? Did it determine the exact relation existing between the solar and lunar motions, and ascertain the true rules and methods of astronomical calculations, so that from the time of its sitting there should be, in no subsequent calendar, any essential error? Nothing of this. It sanctioned only the regulation, that the Festival of

Easter should be celebrated on the Sunday immediately following the first full-moon after the vernal equinox. As to actual computations, the Council left them to a "solitary astronomer," the bishop of Alexandria. In this the members of that body showed their wisdom; as in the time when they assembled, Alexandria was the chief seat of astronomical knowledge. But that the calculations actually made from year to year, of the times of the Paschal full-moon, were ever so "approved by the church, carried into practice by the church, and thus solemnly ratified by the church," as to furnish any pledge or security that in their results no important error should occur, we are unable to see. The Council, evidently, did the best it could; and this is to its credit. Dr. Jarvis himself acknowledges, that "previous to A. D. 1582, the civil computations of the solar year, differed *ten days* from the astronomical. Now, this difference must have originated, either in some mistake on the part of the sun, or in the calculations of those saints and others, whom Dr. Jarvis supposes to have been the "exponents of the time and portion of the church in which they lived." That it was with the latter, we have no doubt he will agree with us. What then does all this parade of catholic practice, of the astronomical labors of St. Hippolytus, of St. Peter and St. Cyril of Alexandria, Victorius, Dionysius, St. Maximus, Bede, and all other ancient computists, and the Council of Nice in addition, amount to? To just nothing;—or nothing of any moment in the present discussion. Astronomical knowledge in the early church, as well as among the ancients generally, was very imperfect, and has been brought to nothing like perfection except in comparatively modern times.

We had said, that the computations of the new-moon in March,

A. D. 28, by Victorius and Bianchini can not stand together. "Therefore," says Dr. Jarvis, "Victorius, or rather the *early church*, told an untruth as to a plain matter of fact." But if the new-moon was on the 14th of March, A. D. 28, according to the computations of Bianchini, it could not have been new-moon three days before, as it was according to the Canon of Victorius. If we admit the Canon of Victorius to be right, we must give up the computation of Bianchini; that is, it could not have been new-moon on the 11th of that month, and again on the 14th, three days after. These two things, we said, "can not stand together," and we say so still. Will Dr. Jarvis say that they can stand together? He speaks of *civil* time as distinguished from *astronomical* time. But did Victorius, or the Council of Nice, make any such distinction? And has not Dr. Jarvis, as we have shown in this number, endeavored to prove, that Victorius and Bianchini substantially agree? Whether "Victorius, or rather the *early church*, told an untruth as to a plain matter of fact," all we have to say is this:—That undoubtedly they spoke, as Dr. Jarvis himself has done in his own mistakes, honestly, and according to the best of their knowledge. If by "a plain matter of fact," the time of the new-moon so often mentioned, is intended, all that Victorius or the church in his time knew of the matter, was, as we believe, through a retrospective calculation by the Canon; and this as we have proved, gave a *wrong astronomical* result. Dr. Jarvis has not shown, nor can he show, nor make it probable, that any nation or individual in A. D. 28, believed that it was new-moon in March on the 11th day; and certainly he can not show this of the Jews. If he can not do this, then he has no means of showing, that the Jews celebrated the Paschal full-moon fourteen days af-

ter; and his whole theory falls to the ground.

Dr. Jarvis, as may be seen in the above extract, finds it impossible to forget the Puritana. In another part of his *Vindication*,\* he corrects a writer in *Blackwood's Magazine*, who has ascribed to the "American mind," what Dr. Jarvis supposes to belong only to the "Puritan mind." He would, therefore, correct the writer in *Blackwood*, and say,—the Puritan is "an endless seeker of truth with no past at his back." We are not about to deny this to be just, nor to admit it to be so;—since we are not greatly solicitous about our own Puritanism—nor are we able to see that any inquiry about this frightful heresy, as contemplated by Dr. Jarvis, is at all connected with the points of chronology, which we have undertaken to investigate. We would ask only, and with no feeling of displeasure—being in fact much more disposed to laugh at his attacks on his and our ancestors, than to be angry—if this account of a Puritan be correct, where does he place himself? Does he imagine, that in his astronomical reveries, he will be regarded as the "exponent of the time and portion of the church in which he lives?" If so, we fear that he is destined to serious disappointment. In these speculations, especially in his mode of calculating a full-moon, he certainly has "no past at his back;" and, though little given to prophesying, we venture to predict that he will have no followers. It may be left then, as a question for the curious, whether his plight in this respect is not that, which he himself denominates "wretched individualism;"—and we would give him a friendly caution to be on his guard, lest he become a Puritan, according to his own definition of one, before he is aware of it.

In the preceding remarks, it has

been our object to meet directly and fully, without any evasion or subterfuge, the arguments of Dr. Jarvis in defense of his chronological positions; so that he may not again be under the necessity of saying, that we have taken no notice of his "strong points,"—that we have hid "from the view of our readers the real state of the controversy,"—and that we are plunging "deeper and deeper into the quagmire of error." To remove in respect to this matter all chance of mistake, we will state particularly the several "points," as we understand them, about which we differ from the author—so far as his work has passed under review.

We have maintained, then, in this and in preceding numbers of the *New Englander*, that Cicero's consulship was in the six hundred ninety-first year of Rome,—that Cæsar's expedition into Spain was in the forty-fifth year *before* our era, —that the death of Augustus was in the fourteenth year *after* our era, —that the supposition of a lost consulship rests upon no proper foundation,—and that neither the year, month, nor day of the month of the Nativity, nor the year of the Crucifixion, has been ascertained by Dr. Jarvis with any near approach to certainty. If he should again honor any part of our observations with a notice, it would be received and acknowledged as a special favor, if he should point out distinctly where our reasoning is deficient. In our comments on his own reasoning we have been careful to adhere to a

rule, which we wish him to observe, and which is so obviously just. General declarations of the weakness of an opponent's course of argument, however they may impose on the understandings of some, go but a little way towards determining a controversy. We will add, that in our remarks we have aimed not at all at novelty. Indeed, after the labors of so many illustrious scholars in this department of learning, an attempt to bring forward anything new, might be thought to border on presumption. What we have said might be supported by a list of names of the highest consideration in historical research. But we are not disposed to rest on mere authority; and would rather appeal to the reasons, which can be urged in support of the opinions we have adopted, than to the names of those, who, as we think, have successfully led the way in chronological investigations.

We are looking rather impatiently for Dr. Jarvis's second volume. The reviewer will be among the first to procure and to read it; but he can think of no probable inducement sufficiently strong to lead him to a public notice of the work, however much he may dissent from the opinions it may contain. He would have abstained from any comments on the first volume, if he had anticipated, that in consequence of what he should write, the author's equanimity would be so greatly disturbed.

## OUR POST-OFFICE.\*

FOORTY years ago, a distinguished scholar of our country† predicted the speedy failure of our federal system from the want of contact of the national government with the people. He said the post-office was the only tie that connected the government with the people, and the only branch of the government of which the people had any personal experience. At that day, the post-office system was in its infancy, comparatively, and its value and importance, as a part of the governmental machinery, and as a source of benefits to the people, were but imperfectly realized. We then had not above 2,000 post-offices, with 35,000 miles of post-roads, and gross receipts of about half a million of dollars. About fifteen years ago, there was a belief prevailing extensively among certain portions of the people, that a distinguished officer of the government had formed a scheme for making the post-office the instrument of an extended political system, designed for the perpetuation of a party and the aggrandizement of its leaders. And the more shrewd observers were convinced that, whether the charge was true or false, the post-office had become so influential a branch of the government, as to be well fitted for such uses, in the hands of an ambitious and intriguing man. Such is the light which experience has thrown upon the predictions of the wise and the forebodings of the prudent, in regard to the working of our system of government. Instead of the govern-

ment perishing for the want of contact with the people, this one branch is found to have mingled itself so intimately with the interests and enjoyments of the people, as to be a source of danger and a cause of alarm for the security of our liberties. Whether Amos Kendall ever had any base designs or not, the fact that he was charged with it, and that the party of which he was a leader was so soon overthrown by the people on this and similar charges, shows the extent to which the conviction has prevailed, that the post-office is capable of being converted into a tremendous machinery of political power of a party over the liberties of the nation.

Politicians, who have been sensible of the danger which might arise from a corrupt administration of the post-office, have hitherto relied for security solely upon one expedient alone—that of limiting the expenditures of the department to its own income. The old saw, that “the post-office must support itself,” has been repeated by men of all parties, until the greater part of them appear seriously to believe that it is found, *totidem verbis*, in the constitution of the United States—just as the same class of learned men quote the New England Primer, Shakespeare, and Tristram Shandy, as veritable Scripture. There is not a word in the constitution that gives the slightest foundation for this axiom. Neither do those who use it ever condescend to argue in its support, for there is as little ground for it in reason as in the constitution. Its whole support is found in the number of times it has been repeated, and in the number of men who have given in their adhesion to it without ever examining its foundation.

The only appearance of an ar-

\* Report of the Post-Master General of the United States, for the year ending June 20, 1847. Documents accompanying the President's Message, 1st Session, 30th Congress, December, 1847.

† Laws and Regulations of the Post-Office Department, 1847.

† President Dwight.

gument in its favor which has ever been vouchsafed, to us is in substance, that unless the post-office is limited by its income, it will be impossible to impose any limit upon its expenditures; that every man will demand a post-office at his own door, and then will demand a daily mail to be brought to him in a stage-coach drawn by four horses, and every public officer will insist upon having the franking privilege, and each party in its alternate periods of power, will not only grant all that every body demands, but will publish more documents than ever were published before, to be franked for the purposes of electioneering, and carried at the public expense. All these things have been done, in certain sections, to a shameful extent; but to say there is no help for it, is to say that there is no power in the government to keep the keys of the public treasury, and is virtually a denial of our national capacity for self-government. We deny this whole theory, and the maxim that has been built upon it, that there is no security against wastefulness except by requiring the post-office to support itself. The government is bound to establish and maintain a post-office, whether the department can sustain itself or not.

There have been fifteen years in which the post-office did not support itself. In 1833 it fell short of paying its own expenses, about \$300,000, and in 1838 nearly \$400,000. There was a deficiency to a considerable extent throughout the five succeeding years, occasioned by the multiplication of private mails, which the government was unable to suppress. This of course gave the lie to our famous maxim, and drove Congress, after much altercation and through many woful displays of ignorance, to the humiliating expedient of underbidding the private mails by putting postage at five cents for all distances under

300 miles. This experiment was tried by the very sticklers for the maxim, amidst their own confident affirmations, that it would be impossible to realize an increase sufficient to pay the expenses of the department. Thanks, however, to Mr. Niles's provision in regard to mail contracts, and to Cave Johnson's stern economy in administration, we not only find the number of letters doubled in two years by a half-way reduction of postage, but the department has been made to support itself, and to promise a surplus of revenue in the current year.

The reduction of postage to five and ten cents was a mere modification of the old system, not the adoption of a new one. It left the franking privilege, the complicated accounts and returns, the consequent need of high compensation to postmasters, and above all, the prevalent superstition, that "the post-office must sustain itself," in its received meaning, to wit, that the letter postage of the north should be taxed to pay for the mail routes of the south, and for the franking of Congress. Its working is therefore by no means a sample of the new system, although its success in a pecuniary view is a conclusive proof that reduction of rate has the same tendency to increase correspondence in this country as in Great Britain. But it left the department, as before, to be still actuated by the principle of ~~exaction~~, as its controlling spirit; and the present Postmaster General is not the man to shrink from carrying out this spirit of the law to its fullest extent. We can not discern or imagine one pretext for exaction, which has escaped his study, or failed of being applied to its utmost extent. Hence the rigor with which he has hunted down the transient newspapers, the complaints about the inclosure of letters for more than one person, often a convenience, and never a burden upon

the department; and hence the painful altercations between the department and members of Congress about franking. Hence, too, the postal war with Great Britain, which almost cut us off from intercourse with Canada, and threatens to subvert our correspondence with Europe at this momentous crisis. All comes from the spirit of *exaction*; and this spirit of exactation in the department fosters and increases the spirit of *caution* in the people; who become as sharp in devising expedients to shun payment, as the government is in multiplying charges.

The system of cheap postage, invented by Mr. Rowland Hill, strikes at the root of the political danger of the post-office, because it brings the department more fully into contact with the whole people, and because it substitutes universal accommodation, instead of rigid exactation, as the pervading spirit of the post-office. The great simplification of the business also strips postage of its pretensions as a mystery, which people must consent to pay for, because they can not understand it. Every body can understand why a barrel of flour weighing two hundred pounds, should cost forty cents to bring it from Albany to Boston; but people can not see why a letter weighing a quarter of a pound should cost the same. They would even agree that it might be right to charge sixteen cents for the letter, at two cents per half-ounce, to pay for the accounts that have to be kept of letters, and for the sake of carrying out the principle of uniformity, and of preventing the mails from being overburdened with weight of parcels. It is stated, however, that the British government have just adopted a modification of the rates of postage on letters exceeding one half-ounce in weight—as the trouble of receiving and delivering is less in proportion on double than on single letters. The mathematical calculations would justify the principle

which was applied to pamphlet postage in our law of 1845, viz., to charge two cents for the first half-ounce, and one cent for each additional ounce, up to the maximum weight allowed to be carried, which is three pounds.

The adoption of the penny rate would neutralize the danger of having the post-office made a political machine for the corruption or the control of the people; just as some poisons are rendered quite harmless by being evenly diffused through the body or through the atmosphere.

The difference between Rowland Hill's system and the old postage is a fine illustration of the difference between truth and error. Truth is beautiful in its simplicity, while there is no end to the diversities of error. The absurdities and inconsistencies into which the system, founded on exactation, has run the post-office, are more than can be enumerated. But every one of them will be cured, as soon as we have adopted the new system, which depends for its success solely upon the extent to which it can accommodate the people. Two years ago, the following diversities existed in our post-office, in regard to the postage on newspapers. The statement was prepared by a New York paper from official documents:

To Canada, prepaid,	1 cent.
To Europe by the Washington and New York line of steamers,	3 cents.
By the British steamers from Boston, sometimes,	3 cents.
By the British steamers from Boston, sometimes,	1½ cent.
By the French steamers from New York,	1 cent.
Inland postage to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, to the lines,	1½ cent.
From New York city to Brooklyn,	3 cents.

It was out of such complexities and absurdities and vexations, in part, that the difficulty arose between our Postmaster General and the British nation, which threatens

to involve the two countries in war. How complicated a machinery is here adopted in regard to postage on newspapers, a business which rarely pays its cost to the department, but which might be made productive by the adoption of a uniform rate of postage, always known, and administered in the spirit of accommodation and not of exaction.

It would be instructive if we could go behind the curtain and see how much study and labor and correspondence and complaint and oppression and fraud have been occasioned by the question, what is a newspaper? The Massachusetts Journal of Education, a semi-monthly paper of sixteen pages, octavo, conducted by Hon. Horace Mann, has been decided, on solemn argument, fortified, I believe, by the grave opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, to be a pamphlet and not a newspaper, because it does not contain the news of the day in regard to politics and markets, deaths and marriages, shocking accidents and bloody murders, but confines its pages to the interests of common schools. And such publications as Littell's Living Age, of forty-eight pages royal octavo, is claimed to be a newspaper, because it gives a paragraph or two of current news of the day. The Journal is taxed two and half cents as a pamphlet, and the Living Age goes for one cent as a newspaper.

What but the worst spirit of exaction could have instigated criminal prosecutions against vessels plying between New London and Sag Harbor, for carrying letters on a mail route, on the pretext that those letters ought to have been sent all the way to New York, and then the whole length of Long Island, taking three days for the journey, and paying five cents to the United States, when the skipper of the fishing smack would carry them across the Sound in six hours for nothing. We never heard that the newspaper

carriers were forbidden to carry papers from New York to Brooklyn, although that is a "mail route" as much as the other. The case was, that the Department did not dare to enforce the law on an interest so powerful, and therefore pounced upon a Long Island skipper to make an example of the inexorable justice of the post-office.

Publishers of newspapers are allowed to send bills to subscribers inclosed in their papers, but if they send receipted bills thus inclosed, both the receipt and the paper with the wrapper, are charged with letter postage at the rate of five or ten cents per half ounce; and this is exacted by the threat that if it is not paid, the sender will be prosecuted for a fine of five dollars.

The only case in which pre-payment of inland postage is positively exacted is that of "transient newspapers," i. e., newspapers not sent from the office of publication. All such papers are left dead in the office where they are deposited, while the senders have no notice, but suppose the information they wish to convey is on its journey. What but the spirit of exaction could have devised so senseless an innovation on established custom? If it is the business of the Department to diffuse information by carrying newspapers at a cheap rate, why is not the information contained in a paper sent by a subscriber to his friend, just as proper to be carried as if it had been sent from the office of publication? The object of the law was to compel men to write letters instead of sending newspapers. The adoption of Rowland Hill's system will put an end to this tyrannical procedure. We have no doubt the post-office has lost twice as much in the suppression of newspaper circulation, as it has gained by compulsory correspondence. One publisher, whose weekly editions amount to only three or four thousand, said that his sales

fell off at least five hundred on the first enforcement of this law.

If a man mails a newspaper which he has received by mail, he must cut off his name which the publisher had written on it; otherwise he will be fined five dollars for conveying the "information" that the paper was from him. Even if it is the name of a stranger, conveying none of the contraband "information," against which our republican rulers have set their faces as a flint, it has at least so shocking an "appearance of evil," as to make it an iniquity to be punished by the judge.

Letters arriving in the office are advertised, and partisan newspapers are paid at the exorbitant rate of two cents per letter for advertising them; and we are informed that not above one-quarter of the letters advertised are ever called for, making a dead loss of at least \$40,000 to the Department for advertising, besides the loss of postage. In England, where letters are not advertised, but delivered by carriers, generally without charge, the proportion of dead letters is only one in two hundred of the whole number. In this country, it is one in twenty-five, after spending forty to fifty thousand dollars for advertising.

By the Act of 1845, printed circulars, folded as letters, were allowed to be sent by mail for two cents postage, provided they contained no writing but the direction and were sent unsealed. If a misprint occurs in the letter as putting a figure 6 for a 9, and this is corrected with a pen or pencil, the charm which produces cheap postage is broken, and the spoiled circular is charged five or ten cents. Now no man can show that it costs the post-office the hundredth part more to carry a written letter than to carry a printed circular of the same weight. Yet they would carry the latter from Calais to Galveston for two cents—now raised to three, while the former is charged ten cents for pre-

cisely the same service. How clearly this demonstrates, that the additional seven or eight cents is neither more nor less than a TAX, imposed upon correspondence beyond its just rate, for the sole object of raising money for other purposes.

Why is it required that these circulars should be left unsealed? Is it to invite and encourage post-office clerks in the habit of opening and examining people's letters? Are the people of this country in fact under an espionage, like that of the old governments of continental Europe, which have been overthrown because their interference with individual freedom had become intolerable? The Postmaster General has told us, over and over, as an ascertained fact, that some people enclose letters for two or more persons in one envelop. What a dreadful crime! No wonder Congress made haste to pass a law imposing a heavy fine upon any one who should have the audacity to put two letters, together weighing the sixth of an ounce, and both going to members of the same family, under one cover, so that the government may carry it for five cents, when it could for the same money carry six such letters, if all were addressed to one person. The question again recurs, How are the servants of the post-office to find out whether this offense has been committed? How did the Postmaster General find out that such things were done? Why, by prying within the covers of people's letters! Is that a practice that ought to be established by law, that our most private letters shall be scrutinized by post-office clerks, boys, young women perhaps, in order to find out whether the government is not entitled to three or five cents more for carrying the letter. Nothing but a system founded on the most false and vicious principles could ever have trained the public mind to submit to such impositions, or embold-

ened our public servants to perpetuate them.

It would be easy to show that these and a hundred other absurdities in the management of our postal system originated in a vain attempt to reconcile inherent incompatibilities. The post-office as prescribed by the constitution, was designed for the public accommodation. And if it were administered in the spirit of the constitution, it would be always actuated and marked by the principle of accommodation, studying how it could be made to yield the greatest convenience to the greatest number at the least expense, and never exacting a farthing beyond what is clearly necessary for the purpose of preventing abuses, and enabling the government to discharge its duty. It can not be shown, by any process of calculation or argument, that *more than two cents* per letter is required for these objects. All the rest of the burthens thrown upon letter postage have arisen from the unconstitutional introduction of the spirit of exaction into our postal system, by the maxim that the post-office must support itself—this maxim rendered still more unconstitutional by the construction that supporting itself means supporting any manner of public burthen that may be thrown upon it. To carry out this principle, in a department designed solely for public accommodation, works just like the other perversions of nature, as where bread is made to yield ardent spirits, or where the laws designed for the protection of liberty are employed for the defense of slavery. You can not make it work well, because it is aiming at ends so incongruous. We must have the post-office brought back to the first principles of the constitution, and made a blessing to the people, and then all these abuses will cease.

Under our present system, nothing is carried out, nothing is harmonious, *every thing* halts and is

marred. You begin by establishing mails and post-offices all over the country, as if your sole object was to accommodate and bind them together by the soft bands of social affection, and then you make all our correspondence run the gauntlet through a set of officials, whose business and praise it is to do every thing in their power to render the use of the post-office annoying and expensive. You undertake to carry newspapers at the lowest rate, because in this country the newspaper is the great vehicle of intelligence, and intelligence is the life of liberty; and then you go into the post-office and stop every newspaper that does not come from the office of publication, unless the sender has pre-paid double the highest rate of newspaper postage. A printed letter goes for three cents, paid or unpaid—a printed newspaper can not leave the office where it is deposited unless three cents are pre-paid; although the printed circular may be sent to Texas, and the printed newspaper only to the next town.

It is unaccountable that so much apathy should have been evinced by the public in regard to the bill of retaliation against Great Britain which is now pending in Congress, having actually passed the House of Representatives almost by acclamation, during one of the paroxysms of "the spirit of '76," as it is the fashion to call every childish exhibition of resentment and revenge towards Great Britain. By that bill, all letters brought to this country by the British steamers are to be charged in our post-office with twenty-four cents postage, although a shilling sterling has already been paid on them in England. This is for ocean postage, over and above the inland postage in this country. A letter from London to Philadelphia will cost fifty cents per half ounce; and all letters designed to be sent out of the country by the British mails, must be pre-paid in our own post-

offices, first the inland postage of five cents or ten cents, then twenty-four cents for retaliation. All this is before it goes in to the British mails, for which it is also charged a shilling on reaching its destination. Letters which are not thus pre-paid will not be forwarded, neither will they be returned to the writers of them, nor any notice given to any body, but all be quietly sent as dead letters to be opened and examined and then burnt at the General Post-Office in Washington. All this trouble the Department undertakes, rather than put the letters into the British mail bag. And no person is allowed to send a letter by the steamer in any other way except through the post-office. And the steamer is to be detained in port until the agent of the post-office has satisfied himself, by a general search or any other process he may choose, that there are no letters on board which have not paid their twenty-four cents. And persons are to be searched, their trunks opened, their clothing unpacked, men are even arrested five hundred miles from the place of embarkation, their baggage sequestered and their persons incarcerated without bail or main-prize, on suspicion that they have letters which they intend to forward by the British steamers. And all this in the name of postage, for the diffusion of intelligence, for the cultivation of social intercourse, for the convenience of the people.

A bill has just been reported in Congress, professedly as a concession to the calls of the people for cheap postage. It abolishes the ten cents rate of postage; thus attesting the mistake of those representatives who were so strenuous for introducing that rate as an amendment to the Senate bill of 1845. It extends the franking privilege of post-masters. It restores the absurdity of a free circulation of newspapers within thirty miles of the place of publication, which was first tried in

1845, and found so ridiculous that it was repealed the next year. It reduces the postage on newspapers to half a cent per hundred miles, and one cent for all greater distances. It allows newspapers under five hundred square inches to go at a quarter of a cent. Pamphlets are to pay two cents for the first ounce, and half a cent for every additional ounce; and the publishers of periodical pamphlets and magazines are to have the same liberty of free exchange with newspapers. It is not stated that it contains a compulsory provision for pre-payment in all cases, or that any difference is made in the rate on account of non-payment in advance.

We hope the bill will not pass. It is not the thing that is wanted, and its adoption will be, in some degree, a hindrance to the introduction of the true system. It is not just, in making so wide a difference between letters, the weight of which never constitutes a burden to the mails, and newspapers, which even now load the mails to a great extent. It continues the wrong, of taxing letters to pay for newspapers. It confers an exclusive boon for the benefit of a particular class—the publishers of newspapers. It makes the postage on newspapers complicated, when all sound wisdom dictates that extreme simplicity in postage is the great desideratum. The distinction in favor of small papers is not warranted by the difference in the expense, as they require the same labor in receiving, delivering, keeping accounts, and making returns. How and in what coin are these half and quarter postages to be paid? Has any body considered the cost in clerk hire to the General Post-Office of these columns of fractions running through all their accounts? The public mind is not in favor of extending the franking privilege, but of suppressing it. From what fund is the money to be drawn to pay for carrying newspapers thirty miles

free of postage? From the letter postage. On the injustice of this we quote from Mr. Dana's minority report in 1845. "It would be grossly unjust to tax the community for the transportation of the letters of individuals," [and the same rule applies equally to their newspapers,] "and it would be not less inequitable to assess the letter-writers as such to pay the expenses of the nation." He represents the post-office as "a kind of joint stock concern for the transportation of letters, and all who use its facilities must contribute to the payment of the expense, in proportion to the extent they enjoy them."

Another objection to the passage of this bill, is the needless expense and labor that will be incurred, by introducing a defective system that can in its nature be but temporary. The rapid progress which the public mind has made in the last six months, in the conviction that two cents postage is the only proper rule, justifies the confident expectation that, by the next session, at farthest, Congress will see the necessity of meeting the public wishes by at once adopting a thoroughly considered and harmoniously arranged system, of which two cents letter postage shall be the basis, with a general provision for pre-payment, either compulsory in all cases, or enforced by a charge of double postage in its default.

The change in the rates of letter postage is too trifling to meet the exigency. The Postmaster General's Report gives the number of five cent letters at thirty-six millions, and of ten cent letters at twelve millions. But we learn that all the *double* letters are included in the returns of the Department as ten cent letters. It is probable that not more than one-sixth of the whole number of letters are sent above three hundred miles. To five-sixths of the letters, therefore, this bill of reduction is no reduction at all. Its adoption will only prepare the way for the restoration

of the private mails on all the most productive routes.

*The Sectional Bearings of the Question of Cheap Postage.*—The sole object of alluding to this relation of the subject, is to show the injustice of the allegation with which our petitions for cheap postage are sometimes met, that we are asking an advantage for ourselves, in the thickly settled parts of the country, *at the expense* of the people of the south and west. It is not so, but the people who now pay the postage for the south and west, ask for the privilege of paying it as they do their share of the other expenses of the government, out of the general treasury, instead of being compelled to pay it by an odious and unjust tax upon their letter correspondence. The Washington correspondent of the *New York Express*, April 13th, 1848, says:

"From an official statement which I have seen to-day, New York pays to the Treasury in the form of postages three times as much as she receives from the same sources for carrying the mails; while Virginia, Georgia, the Carolinas, Alabama, and all the southern states, expend vastly more than they pay for postages. New York, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania pay nearly half a million more than is expended in the three states. There is a moral upon the slave institution, even in a question like this."

In the year 1844, a set of highly valuable tables were appended to the minority report of the post-office committee of the House of Representatives. That report was written, and the tables were prepared, with great care and labor, by Hon. Amasa Dana, of Ithaca, N. Y., to whose exertions the country is very much indebted for the reduction of postage in 1845. The tables show the progress of the Post-office Department, from year to year, from the origin of our present government. They also show the comparative cost and product of the mails in the two great sections of the Union, from which it appears that

the southern states paid a trifle over one-third of the whole amount of postage, while the mail transportation in those states cost considerably over one-half of the whole expense. Also, that the average cost of every description of mail service, was much greater at the south than in the north—nearly in the ratio of three to two. It is impossible that so great a difference in cost can be necessary.

## MAIL SERVICE.

	North. cents.	South. cents.	W. States. cents.
General average of transportation, . . .	8.5	7.	10.2
Transportation on horseback, . . .	5.4	4.7	5.67
Transportation by coaches, . . .	8.8	7.18	11.68
Trans. by railroads and steamboats, . . .	12.8	12.12	15.68
Highest rate on horseback, . . .	6.56	11.	
Highest rate by coach, . . .	9.2	28.12	
High. rate by r. road and steamboat, . . .	16.12	49.72	

North. South.

Whole expense of transportation, . . .	\$1,401,037	\$1,546,182
Whole receipts for postage, . . .	1,966,600	1,000,914
Receipts exceed expenditures, . . .	555,463	
Expenditures exceed receipts, . . .		545,168
Receipts, north exceeds the south, . . .	955,696	

Expenditures, south exceeds north, 145,045

"New York," says Mr. Dana, "pays into the treasury \$725,187, and receives back for mail transportation \$352,329; and the balance of her contributions, amounting to \$372,858, is expended to supply the deficiencies of revenue in other states. Massachusetts pays \$246,961, and receives for mail transportation \$131,749; the balance, \$115,212, is expended in other states. Pennsylvania pays \$334,846, receives \$187,437, and contributes for the use of others \$147,409. The northern section contributes \$555,463 towards the expense of mail transportation at the south. Every southern state, except Delaware and Louisiana, fails to supply an amount of funds sufficient to meet the expenses of the mail transportation within its own limits. North Carolina is deficient \$103,944, Arkansas \$41,006, Alabama \$129,907, Florida \$29,465, Virginia over \$60,000, Georgia over \$76,000, Kentucky over \$58,000, &c. The

VOL. VI.

age paid at the north averages 28.68 cents per head of the whole population; at the south 19.88 cents. The north pays \$2.98 into the common fund, for each dollar paid at the south, and this joint fund is divided almost equally between them. The north are willing to pay as much postage in future as they have done in times past—they ask for no diminution—expend it where it is most needed, for the benefit of the whole country."

And yet the whole south went in a body against the reduction of postage, on the pretense that it was a scheme of the north to avoid their share of the public burdens. It was even said by southern statesmen, under the lead of Mr. M'Duffie, that the post-office was the only branch of the government which the south was not overtaxed to support!

*The Exclusive Right of the Post-office.*—It has been taken for granted, rather than proved, that the right of the federal government to establish mails is an exclusive right. But the public discussions and legal proceedings which took place in the years 1843-5, greatly weakened the public confidence in the infallibility of this axiom. The only argument we have seen in its favor, is that unless the post-office has an exclusive right, it can not support itself. But the constitution contains no intimation that the post-office is bound to support itself, any more than the navy is bound to support itself. Besides, it was proved by our own experience in 1844, that the post-office could not be made to support itself by the exercise of coercive power against private mails. The department was compelled to underbid the private mails, as they were then managed. And the experiment in Great Britain proves, that the post-office can best be made to support itself by adopting the lowest possible rates of postage. And it has been shown that if no burdens are thrown upon letter postage, but those which properly belong to it, the same principles are fully applicable here. What then becomes of the argument for exclusive right?

Does the right given to Congress to levy taxes, deprive the states of the power to levy taxes? The right of Congress to create and sustain an army and navy, did not inhibit the states from doing the same thing, and therefore a clause was inserted in the constitution for this purpose. In the year 1844, a case was argued before the United States District Court at Philadelphia, by the celebrated John Sergeant, and a sketch of his argument was published in the *North American*.

"He contended that the exclusive power of carrying letters had not been given to the government. He insisted that no evidence of such a power is to be found in the constitution, and that if any law of Congress can be shown clearly to assume such an exclusive right, that law is unconstitutional. He exhibited in a bold and striking manner the despotic character of a power which compels the citizen to send his letters by the government post-office, and pay the government price or not send at all. He said that such a monopoly might suit the spirit of Mehemet Ali's government, but could not be compatible with our free system. He compared it to the Spanish monopoly of the tobacco trade—the government forcing all tobacco planters to sell to the monarch, and all tobacco-chewers to buy of the monarch. He showed to what abuses such a monopoly might lead, and maintained that the possible abuses furnished a test of the principle involved in the exclusive claim of the Post-office Department. He urged with great emphasis that the very nature of the power claimed, furnished a most violent presumption that no such monopoly had ever been given by the people to the general government.

"Mr. Sergeant dwelt for a short time on the remarkable fact, that we have not been allowed to avail ourselves of the wonderful improvements of the age, for the purpose of correspondence. He expressed his opinion, that letters might be carried from that city to Boston for two cents."

In the case of the United States *vs.* Adams, of New York, Judge Betts, of the federal District Court, instructed the jury that they could not convict Adams for the act of his agent in carrying letters, unless it was proved to them that he had knowledge of the act. The jury

acquitted Adams. In the numerous prosecutions which were commenced under Mr. Wickliffe's administration, it was generally believed that care was taken not to make a case which would allow the defendants to carry the question up to the Supreme Court for adjudication. All judicious persons agree that the public good requires that the business of establishing post-offices and carrying mails should be conducted under the control of the federal government. And if this control is exercised for the public good, on principles of beneficence and not of exaction, the people will never wish to raise the question, whether the right is exclusive. Let us have cheap postage, and that question may well rest for ever.

The history of postage in this country does not warrant the idea that the right of establishing post-offices should be exclusive in the hands of the general government.

The earliest account we have of any postal arrangements in this country, is found in the records of the General Court of Massachusetts.

"5th, 9th mo., 1639.

"For preventing the miscarriage of letters,—It is ordered that notice be given, that RICHARD FAIRBANKS, his house in Boston is the place appointed for all letters, which are brought from beyond the seas, or are to be sent thither;—are to bee brought unto him, and he is to take care that they bee delivered, or sent according to their directions, and hee is alowed for every such letter 1d. and must answer all miscarriages through his owne neglect in this kind: provided that no man shall bee compelled to bring his letters thither except hee please."

An Act, Jan. 6, 1673-4, allows 3d. per mile to any person that is sent post upon the public service. In 1693, the British government established a post-office for the colonies; and the legislature of Massachusetts passed an "Act encour-

aging a post-office, which provides that no other person than the Postmaster General and his deputies shall carry letters, except private friends or special messengers on private business, on penalty of £40. The postage was for each letter by ship, 2d.; from Boston to Rhode Island, 6d.; to Connecticut, 9d.; to New York, 12d.; to Virginia, 2s.; and 1d. for local delivery. This was a part of the system established for the colonies by the British government, which continued until the revolution. The Postmaster General was appointed by the crown, and he appointed all the local post-masters, who were therefore styled his deputies, as they held their offices under his authority and at his pleasure, and executed them by his directions. The post-office was used as a means of raising revenue from the colonies without their consent, by the power claimed of enhancing the rates of postage at the pleasure of the crown.

In the year 1774, the people resolved to throw off this as well as other oppressions. Public attention was specially aroused by the dismissal of Dr. Franklin from his office of Postmaster General. A letter addressed to Lord North, dated, London, February 5, 1774, calls "the dismissing Dr. Franklin from the Postmaster General in North America," at this particular crisis, "one of the most fortunate events that could have happened" to this country. "The people there never liked the institution, and only acquiesced in it out of their unbounded affection for the person that held the office, who had taken infinite pains to render it convenient to the several colonies. But what will follow now, my Lord? I will tell you; the post from Philadelphia to Boston is that alone which produces any profit, and there the Americans will immediately set up a carrier of their own, which you, with all your brethren in power, to-

gether with Lord Hillsborough's abilities, can not prevent, and thereby they will entirely starve your post between those capital cities. And thus will happily end your boasted post-office, so often given as a precedent for taxing America."

It is evident that the idea of private mails sustained by the popular will for the purpose of starving the post-office, is not original with this generation. In the same month, Mr. William Goddard, printer of the Maryland Journal, brought forward a project for what he called a "Constitutional Post," that is, a post which should not be the instrument of taxing the people, in other words a *free* mail. He came through the country as far as Portsmouth, N. H., and was every where treated with cordiality, in Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Salem, and Portsmouth. Mr. Goddard had himself suffered from the oppressive dictation of the carriers of the royal post. "The sum of £52 per annum was demanded at the post-office, for the carriage of about three hundred and fifty newspapers one hundred and thirty miles." On the 2d of July, 1774, he advertised that he was ready to commence business, having "been warmly and generously patronized by all the friends of freedom in the eastern colonies, where ample funds are already secured." We see where people used to go for funds to establish free mails.

On the 3d of May, 1775, the "New York committee," then in session, appointed a committee to inquire of the postmaster why the postriders to the eastward had been dismissed. The postmaster assigned as a reason, that "the four last mails between New York and Boston had been stopped, the mails broken open, many of the letters taken out and publicly read, some of which were detained," &c. Thereupon, the committee issued a notice that the postriders had been employed to depart on their usual

days for the eastward, and that Mr. Ebenezer Hazard "has undertaken to receive and forward letters."

On the 4th, it was announced in New York, that "an office for this necessary business will doubtless be put under proper regulations by the Continental Congress, and no more be permitted to return to the rapacious hands of unauthorized intruders since it would be the most contemptible pusillanimity to suffer a revenue to be raised from our property to defray the expense of cutting our throats," and that "Mr. William Goddard, who has been a great sufferer, with many others, by the malpractices of an illegal holder of this office," was on a journey to the eastward to put the business in train to be laid before Congress.

Congress established the American Continental post-office in July 26, 1775; and thus superseded all the private mails. Congress then

resolved, "That the communication of intelligence with frequency and dispatch, from one part to another of this extensive continent, is essentially requisite to its safety. That is the corner stone of our American post-office, and not the impracticable dogma that the post-office is bound, in any event, to support itself. The old 'Articles of Confederation' gave to Congress "the sole and exclusive power" to establish mails. The fact that the words "sole and exclusive" were left out of the new constitution in 1787, is conclusive to show that it was not intended to confer an odious and oppressive monopoly upon the government. They had had enough of such a system under the crown. Depend upon it, unless the reasonable wishes of the people are met by Congress; the means will be found of establishing cheap mails on all the productive routes in the country.

#### THOUGHTS ON THE RICHES OF THE NATURAL WORLD.

THE diligent student of Nature, particularly in the departments of Chemistry and Natural Philosophy, will feel, as he advances, a constantly increasing conviction of these three great truths: first, that the world we inhabit is stored with riches far beyond what is generally known or conceived of; secondly, that the world was made for man; and thirdly, that it was made for all mankind,—for the many in contradistinction to the few.

In the present paper, we propose to offer a few observations on the Riches of the Natural World as exhibited in the powers, in the productions, and in the embellishments of the physical creation. Few of our race, it is believed, are aware how noble and beautiful a heritage our Creator has prepared for us—what great and diversified offices the powers of na-

ture stand ready to perform at our bidding—how multiplied are the productions of the natural world, and what a variety of purposes they are severally capable of serving—and what costly ornaments the Divine Architect has employed to decorate this fair workmanship of his hands, the great temple of nature. Nor is the student of nature himself always fully sensible of the extent of her treasures. Each one, for the most part, confines his views to some corner or limited portion of the structure, unconscious of the riches that are stored, with no less profusion, in every other part of the vast edifice. So exhaustless seems to him the particular portion of creation, which he has chanced to select as the field of his own study, that he can hardly imagine that other fields, unexplored by him, are equally filled

with riches and beauty. This, indeed, seems the more incredible to him, because the farther he advances, the more impressed he is with the belief that his own department of nature is the peculiar favorite of heaven, since the more he explores the more exhaustless appears the mine. To each one his own art or science seems more admirable, in proportion as his attainments in it grow higher and higher. Thus the charms of music seem most exhaustless to such proficients as Handel and Mozart; the flower most beautiful to the botanist; the gem most precious to the mineralogist; the bird most interesting to the ornithologist; earth, sea, and air, to the natural philosopher; the starry heavens to the astronomer. But it is only when the powers and the productions of the natural world are surveyed in *all* their amplitude, and in all their relations, that any adequate idea can be formed of the riches of the natural world at large. In estimating the treasures of the vegetable kingdom, for example, how many different views of it must be taken, before its value to man can be fully comprehended. Botany, which describes and classifies the ninety thousand different species of plants; Physiology, which investigates the laws of vegetable life; Chemistry, which explores the hidden elements, and discloses the nature and composition of all vegetable products; Architecture, Agriculture, and Gardening, each in their several departments; Political Economy, which investigates the relations this kingdom of nature bears to the sustenance and comfort of the human race; and finally Taste, which contemplates this part of creation in respect to the images it forms of the beautiful and sublime: all these different sciences and arts must be contemplated, in their respective relations to the vegetable kingdom, before any just conception can be formed of the vastness of its treasures. Indeed, when we con-

sider how boundless is the field which our subject opens, and compare it with the limited nature of our intellectual powers, and the brevity of our lives, we feel that, before we can rise to the full comprehension of the "Riches of the Natural World," we must be endowed with a nobler nature, and clothed with immortality.

Then shall we see and hear and know,  
All we desired or wished below.

Such a view of creation has, we believe, been adequately taken only by spiritual beings, as when "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." But we feel impressed with the solemn thought, that God only has seen even this lower world in the fullness of its treasures; that it formed a part (perhaps but an infinitesimal part) of that first comprehensive view which he took of his new creation, when he *saw every thing that he had made*, and pronounced it "very good." He looked abroad upon the earth and heavens: then, first, the mountains and the hills broke forth into singing, and all the trees of the field clapped their hands.

With what emotions did the Infinite Mind survey his works, and, for the first time, contemplate the great machine of the Universe! It is not irreverent to suppose that He first surveyed it, not only in its external forms of beauty and grandeur, but also in the *laws* which govern its operations, or regulate its motions. Under the control of chemical principles which He had ordained, vapors are beginning to ascend and gather on high in majestic clouds to water the earth with showers—springs are gushing from a thousand fountains—rivers commencing their long circuits to the sea, and the sea rolling its waves. Even the dark recesses of the earth were not hidden; but ere Geology had disclosed its wonders, the deep foundations of the earth in their appointed

order, the records of mighty revolutions in the chaotic period, and glittering stores of mineral wealth, passed in this grand review before the Omniscient eye. Atomic laws were just beginning to exert their sway over the particles of matter, and to evolve new forms of existence, and diamonds and precious stones to send forth their streams of light. Meanwhile, the laws of organic nature were commencing their appropriate functions—seeds germinating—buds swelling—flowers expanding and exhaling their perfumes—and forests beginning to wave. Animals in all their varied tribes are walking on the earth, or flying in the air, or swimming in the floods. Finally, the great Creator lifts his view to the heavens, and beholds the great machine of the Universe commencing its sublime movements—planets and suns just starting on their circuits, some measuring their periods by days, some by years, and some by countless ages—all presenting to the Infinite Mind the purest harmony.

To imitate Jehovah, as one might humbly and reverently presume to do, in such a comprehensive review of his great creation, would require the united powers of the philosopher, the poet, and the Christian. None but the philosopher deeply read in the mysteries of natural science, and able to grasp the laws of the natural world; none but the poet with imagination to kindle and glow as he expatiates over the beautiful realms of nature; none but the Christian whose heart swells with gratitude as he recognizes, in both the laws and the embellishments of the physical world, the language of love; none but he who unites, in enlarged proportions, qualifications so exalted, could ever hope successfully to take the grand review. The illustrious Humboldt, who is attempting a sketch of the natural world, and has already in his “Cosmace” executed some parts of

the portraiture with consummate skill, will, we fear, finally fail of giving the highest possible finish to his great picture, by uniting in his own person only the first two of these qualifications, without even any recognition of the Creator.

But though a survey of creation like that which God himself first took of his works, would be necessary in order to the full comprehension of the “riches of the natural world,” yet even in our present imperfect state, we may form some faint conceptions, at least, of these treasures by contemplating, separately, the powers and the productions of the physical creation. The great powers of nature, namely, attraction, heat, light, electricity, and magnetism, display their riches in the energy of their action, in their adaptation to the condition of man, and in the numerous purposes which they are severally capable of fulfilling.

*First, the forces by which the phenomena of the physical world are controlled, are endowed with astonishing energy.* Examples of this are seen in the expansion and contraction of bodies on heating and cooling; in the congelation of water; in the shrinking of ropes by capillary attraction; in the circulation of vegetable and animal fluids; in the sudden expansion of elastic bodies; in the velocity of light and electricity; and in the effects of gravity at the surface of the earth, or of universal gravitation among the heavenly bodies. The hardest rocks are split to a great depth by kindling a fire on the top, and, when the surface is red hot, dashing on buckets of cold water. The unequal contraction consequent on sudden cooling, rends the mass from top to bottom. A few years since, a large public building in the city of Paris, was found to be in danger of falling, in consequence of its opposite walls having lost their parallelism, so that the upper portions

were slowly but constantly receding from each other. To arrest the danger, small holes were drilled through the walls, in which were inserted iron wires extending horizontally between the opposite walls, and protruding through them on the outside. To one end was attached a nut closing upon the outside of the wall, while the other end was fixed into a screw to which a corresponding nut was attached. All things being thus arranged, lamps were suspended from the wires, which thus became heated, and of course expanded in length. While in this state, the nuts were turned upon the projecting screws, close to the wall. The lamps being now extinguished, the wires contracted to their original length, and with so much force as to draw the massive walls to a perfect parallelism. The violence with which water expands as it freezes, is known by many familiar examples. In an experiment in which this force was made to burst a metallic ball, it was estimated at more than twenty-seven thousand pounds. The enlargement of volume is ascribed to the crystalline arrangement which the particles assume in congelation, and the force exerted is, therefore, merely that which accompanies crystallization. Capillary attraction also affords many instances of the energy with which even the humbler powers of nature act. There was an obelisk of vast weight at Rome lying on the ground, which it was required to raise and place upon a pedestal. Appropriate machinery with ropes were employed, by means of which the mass was lifted from the ground; but the ropes having stretched, it could not be swung clear of the pedestal. The labor of numerous hands for many days seemed to have availed nothing, when, by a fortunate suggestion, the ropes were wet, and contracted with so much force as to lift the obelisk to the full height required. Millstones are

quarried in France, by introducing into a seam prepared for the purpose, wedges of willow wood, and exposing them to the damp air of night. By the moisture which they imbibe by capillary attraction, they swell with such force as to cleave off the huge blocks of stone.

The force with which the *sap* of trees circulates, is sometimes prodigious. Many years ago Dr. Hales measured this force, by causing it to act against a column of quicksilver, and found it capable of supporting a column thirty-two and a half inches in height, exceeding therefore the pressure of the atmosphere, being more than sixteen pounds upon every square inch. But the foregoing are feeble manifestations of the energy of the powers of nature, compared with those exhibited by heat, both directly and through the medium of elastic fluids. It is calculated by engineers that there is *virtue* in a bushel of coals properly consumed to raise, a foot high, seventy million pounds weight. Sir John Herschel sets forth the energy of this force by several striking illustrations. He shows that the force expended in the toilsome ascent of Mount Blanc, is only equivalent to that afforded by the combustion of two pounds of coal; that the celebrated Menai bridge in Wales, which consisted of a mass of iron not less than four millions of pounds in weight, and was suspended at a medium height of one hundred and twenty feet above the sea, could be lifted to its place by the force generated by only seven bushels of coals; that the great pyramid of Egypt, which covers eleven acres of ground, and is estimated to weigh more than twelve thousand millions of pounds, required to raise it a power no greater than is contained in six hundred and thirty chaldrons of coal, a quantity consumed in some foundries in a week.

The violence with which gun powder explodes, is only an instance

of the energy of the force of repulsion, by which elastic fluids seek to expand. Count Rumford has estimated that twenty-eight grains of powder, which he confined in a cylindrical space that it just filled, exerted a force in tearing asunder a piece of iron, which would have resisted a strain of four hundred thousand pounds. Yet, astonishing as are these examples of the energies of the powers of nature, the chemist in his laboratory evolves expansive compounds immensely more violent; and whose force is wholly inmeasurable.

Light, electricity, and magnetism, manifest wonderful energy in the velocity of their motions. How indistinct is our usual conception of the speed of light, when we reflect that it would dart across the Atlantic ocean in the sixty-fourth part of a second, and, in the fifth part of a second, would circumnavigate the globe! Yet the velocity of electricity is still greater. According to a beautiful series of experiments of Prof. Wheatstone, published in the Philosophical Transactions for 1834, the electric fluid in passing through a conducting wire from one side of a charged jar to the other, has a velocity exceeding 576,000 miles in a second of time.

Gravity, however, surpasses all other natural forces in the grandeur of its exhibitions of mechanical power. Although the amount of gravity contained in so small a mass as a trip-hammer, is but an infinitesimal part of that which the earth can put forth, yet the momentum with which this instrument descends, affords a glimpse of the power it represents. But we are most familiar with the exhibitions of gravity in bodies descending inclined planes, as in the avalanche and the cataract. An attempt has recently been made by Mr. Z. Atlee to estimate the mechanical power exerted by the Falls of Niagara. He comes to the conclusion, that "the motive power of

the Cataract of Niagara, exceeds by nearly forty fold all the mechanical force of water and steam power, rendered available in Great Britain; for the purpose of imparting motion to the machinery that suffices to perform the manufacturing labors for a large portion of the inhabitants of the world, including also the power applied for transporting these products by steamboats and steam cars, and steam ships of war, to the remotest seas. Indeed it appears probable that the law of gravity, as established by the Creator, puts forth in this single water-fall more intense and effective energy, than is necessary to move all the artificial machinery of the habitable globe."\*

Yet, how inconsiderable is the exhibition of power manifested in the Cataract of Niagara, compared with that of the same force as it resides in the sun, and causes the planets to revolve around it as a centre. If we could conceive of a giant of such strength as to be able, when standing on a small island in the ocean, and holding upon a rope attached, at the farther end, to the bow of a ship of war under full sail, to draw the ship from its course and cause it to turn around the island, the powers of the giant would seem miraculous; yet, by a force exerted on the planets in a somewhat similar way, the sun turns them from the straight courses in which they tend to move, and compels them to revolve around him. Here, instead of a ship of war, are worlds, some of which vastly outweigh the earth; and worlds, moreover, arrested and turned aside, when moving with a velocity exceeding, in some instances, sixty times the greatest velocity of a cannon ball. But of little avail, for the purposes of man, would be the fact that the powers of nature act with such immense energy, if they were incapable of being ap-

propriated by him to his own use in just such portions as his exigencies require. Therefore,

Secondly, the powers of nature display their riches, *by their adaptation to the condition of man*. The property of elasticity, for example, we may employ either in the delicate hair-spring of a watch, or in the force of gunpowder to blow up a ship of war. Heat we may appropriate to use, throughout an immense range of temperature; employing it, at one time, on the domestic hearth to impart a gentle warmth to the air we breathe; at another, at a higher degree, to boil water and prepare our food; and we may successively ascend the scale, until we fuse metals, and dissipate in vapor the most obdurate substances, as lime and magnesia. We may use a single degree of heat to impart a softness to the air of a room, or we may employ nearly twenty thousand degrees to melt platina. Yet the manageableness of this power, is not so conspicuous when applied directly to bodies, as when employed in the form of steam. So unlimited is the range of force in the elasticity which heat imparts to steam, that, by its aid, man with almost equal ease, draws out a thread finer than a gossamer, and conducts a thousand tons of merchandise on a railway, or a mighty ship across the ocean.

The power which man may borrow from these great forces of nature by appropriating them to his use, is finely illustrated in the *magnetic telegraph*. Here is a single property,—namely, the property of metallic substances to conduct the electric fluid nearly instantaneously,—which lay for several centuries a barren fact. It might, indeed, have been anticipated, by a sound analogy, that so remarkable a property as this would one day be converted to the use of man and made to achieve for him things equally re-

markable;\* but still the knowledge of this property remained entirely unproductive, until, at quite a recent period, the obvious thought came up that electricity might, by means of this property, become the vehicle of intelligence, and convey it with the speed of lightning. Already has this obscure property of electricity, but yesterday a barren fact in Natural Philosophy, changed the face of society, nor can human sagacity divine all the changes which it is destined to effect in the affairs of this world. Even during the short time the magnetic telegraph has been in operation, what wondrous changes it has produced! Intelligence of every kind, political, commercial, personal, and scientific, is borne not on the "wings of the wind," but on the wings of lightning. News of elections, of revolutions, of the operations of war and the negotiations of peace, of every new measure of government, of every judicial decision, radiates from its respective centers, and diffuses itself over the earth with the velocity of light. During the recent convention at Philadelphia for nominating a candidate for President of the United States, intelligence of the final ballot reached New Haven via Pittsburg, Cleveland and Buffalo, in a few minutes after the result was announced! Nor is commercial intelligence exceeded by political in celerity; but notices of departures and arrivals, of changes in foreign markets, the price current for the day of merchandise and stocks, flow from the great metropolis in a manner resembling, but

\* Whenever a singular and remarkable property is observed in any substance, natural or artificial, it may be inferred that extraordinary effects will one day be performed with it. Thus it might easily have been asserted that a substance so elastic, so tough, so impervious to air and water, as India Rubber, was never intended by Providence merely to rub out pencil marks, which was the principal use to which it was devoted until within a short period.

greatly exceeding in velocity, the circulation of the blood as it is propelled from the heart through all the arteries. Orders for merchandise, and receipts of money, are sent from remote parts of the Union to the Atlantic cities, or in the opposite direction, with equal speed. At Hudson, in Ohio, at half past three o'clock, in the afternoon, full intelligence is received of all the transactions of business, and of all important events that have transpired in the city of New York up to three o'clock. At all places westward of the metropolis, differing in longitude a degree or more, news is received at an earlier hour of the day than that at which it is transmitted; so completely has man, by this appropriation of one of the great powers of nature, learned to outrun the diurnal revolution of the earth. At St. Louis, the time of the day at which intelligence is received from New York may be earlier than that at which the message is dispatched, by a whole hour; so that news sent from the metropolis at three may reach the western capital the same afternoon at two o'clock. A singular aid may be afforded to commerce and navigation by the power of the electric telegraph to herald the approach of storms. "In the Atlantic ports of the United States, (says Mr. Redfield,) the approach of a gale, when the storm is yet on the Gulf of Mexico, or in the southern or western states, may be made known by means of the electric telegraph. This will enable the merchant to avoid exposing his vessel to a furious gale soon after leaving her port. By awaiting the arrival of the storm, and promptly putting to sea with its closing winds, a good offing and rapid progress will be secured by the voyager."\*

Personal and domestic intelligence is carried with the like astounding results. A lady of Springfield re-

cently received a message from Hartford at twenty minutes after ten o'clock, A.M., five minutes after the order was given at Hartford, desiring her presence in that city, the distance being twenty-eight miles. She left there soon after by the cars and arrived at Hartford at ten minutes after eleven o'clock, only fifty-five minutes from the time the request was first communicated at the telegraph office.

Nor do the results of the telegraph appear less promising or remarkable in relation to the purposes of science. This instrument affords one of the best methods of finding the *difference of longitude* between two places. Any signals made between two distant places at the same moment of *absolute time*, will lead to a knowledge of the difference of *local times* between the two places at that moment, and thus (allowing a degree for every four minutes) the difference of longitude becomes known. The magnetic telegraph by transmitting such signals *instantaneously*, affords a peculiarly convenient and accurate method of accomplishing this object. During the year 1847, Mr. S. C. Walker, of the Coast Survey, arranged a plan for determining, by this method, the difference of longitude between Washington City, Philadelphia, and New York. The observations were skilfully conducted, at the foregoing places respectively, by Professors Maury, Kendall, and Loounie, and the result showed that this method of finding the difference of longitude, would compare with the most accurate method hitherto discovered.

Many phenomena of nature are of transient duration, and in order to simultaneous observations of those in different places, nothing can be conceived of more fortunate than the electric telegraph, by which notice of the occurrences may, within a few minutes, be communicated to astronomers over a whole continent. Had the news that the great

\* Amer. Jour. Science, Nov., 1846.

Comet of 1843 was shining, as it did with portentous brightness, near the sun at noonday, been heralded by the telegraph through the United States, instead of the startling sight being confined to three or four individuals capable of taking accurate observations upon it, hundreds of astronomers might have enjoyed the exciting spectacle, and recorded the movements of the wonderful stranger.

Professor Loomis, in the investigation of the phenomena and progress of a great storm that traversed a large part of the United States, sought by very numerous inquiries, involving a laborious correspondence, to ascertain the condition of the atmosphere, and state of the weather, throughout all parts of the Union at the same time, by which important and interesting conclusions are drawn respecting the laws of storms. It is easy to see how happily the electric telegraph might be employed, to convey to a common focus, information respecting these and other meteorological phenomena.

The foregoing examples of the practical uses to man of electricity,—uses developed in the infancy of the invention of the electric telegraph,—are to be regarded only as an earnest of what this power is destined to achieve for man; and they furnish but one among a thousand instances of the fertility of a single property of one of the great powers of nature.

Thirdly, *the powers of nature display their riches by the numerous purposes which they are severally capable of fulfilling.* This characteristic also holds good with respect to many of the *productions* of the natural world, a few of which are so fertile in useful properties and applications, as to seem the favorites of nature. The four substances selected by the ancients as the elements of all things, namely, fire, air, earth, and water, afford, severally,

happy examples of the riches of the natural world, in the vast number of ways in which they serve the happiness or comfort of the human family. It is, indeed, one mark by which the gifts of nature are distinguished from the works of art, that the former usually serve a vast many different purposes, while the latter are for the most part limited to a single purpose. An artist expects nothing else of a watch than accurately to give the time of day, nor any thing more of the telescope than to afford an improved view of the heavenly bodies. But not so with the works of nature: they are seldom limited to a single useful purpose, and even where a single object seems to have been in view as the chief end, so many subordinate and incidental ends are carried along in its train, that these sometimes almost surpass in utility the main design. Thus the air is so intimately associated with animal life, that to breathe is to live, and to cease to breathe is to die; yet how numerous and diversified are the other purposes which the atmosphere fulfills! It conveys to plants as well as animals their nourishment and life; it tempers the heat of summer with its breezes; it binds down all fluids and prevents their passing suddenly into the state of vapor; it supports the clouds, distils the dew, and waters the earth with showers; it multiplies the light of the sun and diffuses it over earth and sky; it feeds our fires, turns our machines, wafts our ships, and conveys to the ear all the sentiments of language and all the melodies of music; and, finally, furnishes a medium through which the numerous feathered tribes may reach their aerial habitations, or perform their joyous evolutions, or take their distant journeys through the skies.

The element of *earth*, composing as it does the fabric of the globe, seems intended, in its *main design*, to furnish a resting place for man

and his works ; a footstool for all animals that roam on its surface, or a shelter for such as dwell in its caverns ; and a mechanical support and a medium of sustenance to trees and plants. But, to multiply its *incidental* benefits, here the earth rises in cool mountains, there it sinks in fertile vales, and there it spreads in luxuriant plains. The beautiful and sublime are profusely scattered over its broken surface, while beneath repose exhaustless quarries of granite, and free-stone, and marble ; mines of iron and coal, of salt and gypsum ; veins of lead and tin, of silver and gold ; and scattered treasures of the ruby, and emerald, and sapphire, and diamond.

But such *general* statements as we have hitherto made, can never convey so full an impression of the riches of the natural world, as the complete analysis of some one of the productions of nature, exhibited in all its useful properties, and relations. Let us then descend from generalities, and take a more minute and comprehensive view of the resources of nature, as exemplified in the various properties and uses of Water ; contemplating this substance, successively, in its Natural History, its Chemical, its Physiological, and its Mechanical properties and relations.

1. Natural History contemplates things as presented to the eye by nature herself ; and the Natural History of Water, comprehends, first, its *external characters* as exhibited in the different forms of oceans, lakes, rivers, springs, and atmospheric vapor ; and, secondly, the *circulatory system*, by which it is made to revolve in an endless round from the sea to the land, and back again from the land to the sea.

The ocean has an average depth of about five miles,\* and covers full three fourths of the globe.

\* Philosophers differ in their estimates of the depths of the ocean. According to La Place its average depth is no more

The animal tribes that live in the sea, have, therefore, a far more ample domain than those which inhabit the land. Fishes occupy the ocean to the depth of six hundred feet, and are supposed to possess a dwelling fourteen hundred times more spacious than those animals that tenant the surface of the earth. Whales, and a few other aquatic animals, occasionally plunge much deeper into the abyss than the limit here assigned.

Before we reflect on the riches of the ocean, we are apt to think of the "wide waste of waters" as an unfruitful desert ; but when we come to view the important offices it fulfills in the economy of nature, and see what treasures it conceals in its deep recesses, and what facilities it affords for intercourse between the nations of the earth, we no longer look upon this part of creation as furnishing an exception to the general riches of the natural world. So important is the part which the ocean performs in the circulatory system of waters, that this perhaps may be regarded as its chief end, while all the other useful purposes it serves, may be considered as merely incidental. In the early periods of society, two things seemed mysterious—why the sea was not full, and why the land was not drained of all its waters. The rivers only return to the sea the water they had previously borrowed from it. It was first raised in vapor from the wide expanse, borne by winds over the land, and supplied to it under the forms of dew, rain, and snow. The rivers

than five miles, although, from the phenomena of the tides, he infers that the Atlantic, in the central part, is nine miles deep. The deepest soundings hitherto made, were instituted by Capt. Ross, in the middle of the South Atlantic, (Lat. 15° S., Long. 23° W.) where no bottom was found at the depth of 27,600 feet, or more than five miles. In other places, apparently in mid-ocean, bottom has been reached at depths varying from 12,000 to 18,000 feet.—(Wilkes, in Am. Jour. Science, Jan. 1848.)

run down to the sea loaded with impurities, but in the returning system all things are directed towards restoring the water to perfect purity, and collecting it again in the interior of the earth in sweet fountains. As it rises from the sea by the process of natural evaporation, it leaves behind the salt and every foreign substance; but as it is liable again to imbibe impurities from the atmosphere, it is subjected to a thorough filtration as it penetrates the upper strata of the earth (which are of a texture admirably adapted to this purpose) and returns to its pristine state divested of every unwholesome property. When the earth is frozen, and can no longer cleanse the water by filtration, the drops of rain crystallize in the form of snow, and thus attain a similar purity. Beneath the sand and gravel that compose the upper surface of the earth, and furnish a medium so suitable for the purpose of filtration, there is usually found, at a moderate depth, a stratum of clay which arrests the descent of the water, and renders it easily accessible by man. But sometimes this is wanting, and the water collects in reservoirs at great depths in the interior of the earth. These, however, may generally be reached by Artesian wells, some of which have been opened to the depth of more than 2,000 feet; and thus, in nearly every place on the habitable surface of the globe, man has it in his power to supply himself with an element so essential to his happiness, in a state of perfect purity. When collected in these deep reservoirs, being under strong pressure, it imbibes and retains a larger quantity than usual of atmospheric air, or carbonic acid, the escape of which, when the water is drawn to the surface, imparts to it that sparkling quality, which is so inspiring in the waters drawn from these salubrious fountains. Sometimes the springs that issue from these deep reservoirs, bring up intelligence of the

heat of the interior of the earth, or become impregnated with saline and gaseous substances, and gush forth in thermal springs and life-giving fountains. Rivers, in their main design, seem destined merely for returning to the sea the waters that were before raised from it, after they have refreshed and fertilized the earth, and replenished the internal reservoirs; but, in consonance with the general analogies of nature already explained, they are made to accomplish many other benevolent purposes: they impart fertility as they run; they wind their way through devious courses, both to retard the velocity of their descent, and more widely to spread their blessings over green meadows and flowery vales; they open a way into the heart of every country for vessels and steamboats; and, at every step of their progress, they offer to the feeble arm of man the aid of their vast mechanical power. If rivers open a way into the heart of every country, so the ocean opens a vast highway to all parts of the earth, and unites all nations in the bands of commerce, giving to each country the choicest productions, natural or artificial, of mind or matter, of every other. Nor is it alone in view of the circulatory system of waters, or as the medium of commercial intercourse, that the ocean contributes its share to the riches of the natural world. If we reflect how many articles of convenience or luxury, and how large a part of the food of man, are derived from the ocean, we shall find that its own inherent treasures are immense.

The Natural History of water affords so many illustrations of its uses, that we seem to require no further developments of the riches that lie folded up in this wonderful element; but we have only just begun to unveil its treasures, and hasten therefore, to contemplate,

2. The **CHEMICAL** properties of Water. Chemistry takes cognizance

of water in respect to the elements of which it is composed, and to the changes of nature which it is capable of producing in all other substances, or of receiving from them. In its composition water is remarkable, being constituted solely of oxygen and hydrogen, the two most important simple bodies known to Chemistry, oxygen being the great supporter of combustion, the vital principle of the air in respiration, and the most general acidifier; being present in greater or less proportion, in nearly every compound, whether in the mineral, the vegetable, or the animal kingdom; and hydrogen constituting either wholly or in part almost all combustible bodies;\* while the two elements, uniting in various proportions, form in conjunction with pure charcoal (carbon) the greater part of the material of all vegetables. Since water consists of two elements, of which one is the most combustible of bodies, and the other the great agent which sustains combustion, the idea has long been entertained, that water itself may be so treated that its elements shall no longer so act as to neutralize each other's properties, but shall severally exert their individual properties and thus become fuel. Nor are there wanting experiments which favor this idea, and encourage the hope, that, when the forests are consumed and the mines of coal exhausted, there may be found in water itself a store-house of fuel, adequate to the utmost wants of man.

Not only do the elements of water, individually, perform most extensive and important functions in the economy of nature, but water itself, in its own capacity, has affinities so numerous and powerful, and is so constant an agent in all the changes

effected in the processes both of nature and art, that it is no wonder if some of the ancient philosophers, particularly the disciples of Thales, held water to be the primordial element, out of which all things were formed. In every process of fermentation, by which substances undergo successive changes of nature, until they finally return to their ultimate elements; in all spontaneous decompositions; in short, in all chemical processes, involving a large proportion of the operations of the arts, the presence of water is wholly indispensable. Water is of all fluids (with the exception, perhaps, of the gastric liquor) the most general solvent; and its agencies, dependent on this property, are exceedingly numerous and important. In consequence of this power, it reduces the particles of solid bodies to such a state of division as to allow them to enter freely into combination with each other, and hence solution becomes an essential preliminary in almost every case of chemical composition and decomposition, and in by far the greater number of cases, water is the solvent employed. By this, water becomes so essential in the preparation of our food; by this it takes up nourishment from the soil and conveys it through the delicate organs of plants; and by this it acts as a universal detergent, cleansing everything, and discharging all impurities that may soil the person or the clothing of man, and then by the process of evaporation and filtration as explained when speaking of the "circulatory system," restoring itself again to perfect purity. Few things appear more admirable to the student of nature, than the discrimination which water exhibits in the different degrees of solvent power it exerts upon different substances, dissolving just so much only as the perfect economy of nature in each case demands, but still leaving it to man to exert its solvent power

\* Since oxygen is contained in almost all bodies, its presence in water may appear little remarkable; but it constitutes so large a proportion of this body, that water seems the original source or fountain-head of oxygen.

by heat whenever he requires them to act with greater energy.

The different states which this substance assumes, appearing at different times, under the forms of water, ice, snow, and vapor, render it the chief agent in controlling the temperature of the air, and in confining its range to such narrow limits, which however could not be transcended without the destruction of every living thing. In the fusion of platina we raise a heat of nearly 20,000 degrees, and by the galvanic deflagrator, and the oxy-hydrogen blow-pipe, we may produce a temperature immeasurably higher than this. Also, in the process for the solidification of carbonic acid, chemists reach a degree of cold equal to 174 degrees below zero. So immense then, is the range of temperature of which heat is susceptible. Yet nature most studiously confines the heat of the surface of the globe within the narrow limits of less than 200 degrees, from the lowest to the highest temperature ever exhibited by the atmosphere. The principal guards which Providence has set to defend us from the excesses of heat and cold, which might so easily destroy us on either side, are the different states which water is made to assume at different temperatures. When ice melts it absorbs and renders latent 140 degrees of heat; and when water is converted into vapor, it absorbs in like manner nearly 1000 degrees of heat. In each case, the heat combines with the solid or liquid to form the water or the vapor respectively, but does not raise its temperature in the least. Hence the melting of ice or snow, and the evaporation of water, are severally cooling processes. On the other hand, when vapor is condensed, or returns to the state of water, the 1000 degrees of heat in vapor, and the 140 degrees in ice and snow, are given out, and thus condensation and congelation become heating processes. Now, to

see how these principles so apply in nature, as to obviate the dangers to which animal and vegetable life are exposed from excesses of heat and cold, suppose on the return of autumnal frosts we observe the thermometer to descend (as it frequently does) from 70° to 32° within a few hours. When it has reached this point, its further descent is retarded, and it is usually soon brought to a stand; and the whole severity of winter is required in order to reduce it only a few degrees lower. But what prevents the temperature from continuing to sink as rapidly as it begun, and occasioning a sudden and destructive frost? As soon as the cold begins to grow severe and threatening, water instantly changes its state from a fluid to a solid, giving out its latent heat to the atmosphere, and thus preventing the farther increase of cold. On the other hand, suppose a very hot day in summer is passing over us, and the thermometer rises rapidly to 90°. We feel that the heat is approaching a dangerous excess, but some cause usually arrests it at this point, and in our climate, the utmost fury of a summer's sun hardly suffices to carry the heat a few degrees higher. That cause is the evaporation of water, which, by rendering latent in the state of vapor, so large a quantity of sensible heat, withdraws from the atmosphere that portion which would otherwise accumulate to a dangerous degree. Water, therefore, stands as a sentinel on either hand, to guard all living things from the region of death that lies just beyond the narrow precincts to which the entire range of atmospheric temperature is confined. Water serves also a similar purpose in the form of snow. When, as the wintry sun no longer affords heat from without, and it becomes essential to the preservation of the vegetable kingdom, that the heat of the earth should be prevented from escaping,

then the drops of rain crystallize in the form of snow, which invests the earth with a downy covering, increasing, like the furs of animals, in thickness and fineness, in proportion as we advance nearer the pole. Beneath this warm mantle, delicate plants repose in perfect security, while the most bitter frosts are raging without; and the rivers, lakes, and seas, first bridged over with ice, and then protected with this thick covering of snow, are kept so warm, even in the polar regions, as to afford a safe and happy dwelling place for the numerous tribes of aquatic animals, which inhabit their waters. But our limits forbid us to pursue farther the chemical agencies, and we proceed to consider,

3. The PHYSIOLOGICAL properties of Water.—Chemistry respects matter without life; Physiology, *living* matter, and hence takes cognizance of those properties and relations of water, which appertain to the vegetable and animal kingdoms. Every one is witness how essential water is to the vegetable world; even the most careless observer of nature, sees how plants flourish and grow under the genial influence of dew and rain, and how they wither and decay when this aliment is denied them. Chemistry and physiology teach us why the presence of water is so useful to plants and flowers, since it both supplies a large part of the material of which vegetables are composed, and dissolves other constituents of plants, and thus conveys nourishment through all their delicate vessels. To the animal kingdom, water is no less a benefactor. As a *beverage*, it is truly one of heaven's choicest gifts to man and beast. With it the lower animals rest satisfied; man attempts substitutes; but, for the most part, to his hurt. Nature testifies her intentions by the most impressive signals, showing here, as in many other cases, the supremacy of her law—that the exercise of any lawful pas-

sion or appetite, satisfies; of any unlawful, inflames. Thus water allays, alcohol increases, thirst. As the *means of preparing the food* of animals, especially of man, the value of water is inestimable. Count Rumford was of opinion that water does not always act merely as a solvent, but sometimes is itself converted into food, since his soups, prepared for the poor of Bavaria, seemed to possess a greater amount of nutrient, than could be accounted for from the solid matter present. As a *medicine*, the virtues of water are beginning to be more generally acknowledged, and we know not yet the full extent of its healing powers. In the form of medicinal springs, its virtues have long been tested. Many are the subordinate offices which water performs for the animal system, in lubricating the eye, softening the organs of respiration, and, under the form of perspiration, both sensible and insensible, regulating the temperature of the body, and discharging from it many principles unfriendly to life and health.

4. The MECHANICAL PROPERTIES of Water, alone remain to be considered.

By its *mobility*, water secures its perfect equilibrium or level, so essential to the safety of the inhabitants of the land, and carries into perpetual execution the fiat of the Almighty: "Hitherto shalt thou come and no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." By its *buoyancy*, water furnishes a dwelling place for all aquatic tribes, and lays the foundation for the whole art of navigation. By its *pressure*, when at rest, it furnishes a most effective and convenient force as in the hydraulic press; and, when in motion, as in the river or the cataract, supplies to man an exhaustless fund of mechanical power, ready to turn his machines, and perform all his labors. Finally, in the form of *steam*, a mechanical power is evolved from water, the use of which has

likened man to the Genii of ancient fable.

When the *naturalist* contemplates water under all its forms in internal reservoirs, in springs, rivers, lakes, seas, and oceans; when he surveys the beautiful "circulatory system" by which it rises into ethereal vapor, to scatter its treasures over the vegetable and animal kingdoms, in dew, rain, and snow; when he considers what tribes of aquatic animals it maintains; when he sees how large and important a part it forms in the beautiful and sublime of nature, whether glistening in the dew-drop, sailing in clouds of majestic forms and various dyes, or shining in the mountain lake, and reflecting the heavens from its surface, or winding through fertile valleys in graceful streams, or thundering in cataracts, or, finally, rolling in ocean waves; in view of all these relations to Natural History, the naturalist feels that the world of waters is all his own. But the *chemist* is no less sure that water was created for him, when he looks at its remarkable composition, constituted, as it is, of two such important elements as oxygen and hydrogen; when he contemplates its endless affinities, its powers as a solvent, and its capacity of assuming the different states of solid, liquid, and seriform, and thus regulating the temperature of the globe, and guarding it against dangerous excesses of heat and cold; and when, in short, he sees how all the chemical arts require the aid of water as indispensable at every step

in their multiform operations. The *physiologist* asserts his claim to water, as affording to plants their most essential aliment, that on which depend their full development, their perfect growth, and the beauty and fragrance of their flowers; and as supplying to animals their beverage, and to man, especially, the menstruum of his food, his medicine, his luxurious baths, and his life-giving fountains. At last, the *mechanical philosopher* claims water to turn his machinery, to bear his ships, and to roll his cars. The ocean wave and the cataract are his, by the vast force they put forth; and the gushing fountain and flowing river are his, by the mechanical laws which they illustrate; and, finally, water is his by the wonderful powers of steam, which it folds within it, the greatest of all auxiliaries to the feeble physical powers of man.

The *lover of universal nature*, with a more enlarged vision, comprehends in his view the relation of water to all these different departments,—to Natural History, to Chemistry, to Physiology, and to Mechanical Philosophy, and he, only, it is that duly estimates the treasures that lie buried beneath it.

After such an examination of the "riches of the natural world" as illustrated both by the powers and the productions of nature, we are prepared for the inquiry, whether in conformity with the prevailing opinion, *the world was made for man*,—an inquiry which we hope to resume in a future number.

## THE CHURCH—AS IT WAS, AS IT IS, AS IT OUGHT TO BE.

This is the title of a discourse, founded on Matt. xvi: 18. "On this rock will I build my church"—delivered at the dedication of the Chapel built by the church of the Disciples in Boston, March 15, 1848, by the pastor of the church, the Rev. James Freeman Clarke, a gentleman distinguished in that class of Unitarians who have of late years manifested a tendency to return to evangelical principles. Speaking of what orthodoxy has, in which the Unitarians are deficient, he says:

"It understands the meaning of the Gospel, as differing from the law, better than we do, and sees its special adaptation to the needs of the sinner, as we have not generally apprehended it. It sees that God actually came into the world in Christ, infusing a new life-element, commencing a new movement, beginning a new series of influences. Hence it perceives that Christianity is really a supernatural gift, coming from above the natural order of things, and that those who receive it are actually born into a higher life. Thus it transforms duty into love; instead of a conscientious effort to do right, it creates a grateful affection, which carries us forward, as the advancing tide bears a navy on its bosom. It animates man with the power of faith in unseen and eternal things, and so gives an energy and force which no merely earthly considerations can produce."—p. 21.

In accordance with these views, Mr. Clarke seems to have more sympathy with the orthodox sects, than with some Unitarians, and we should be less surprised to hear that he has renounced Unitarianism and embraced fully the doctrines of Christ's supreme divinity and atoning sacrifice, than to learn that he has abandoned the prayer meeting and ceased to preach the necessity of "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." There is a relation between the doctrines of Christianity, each requiring

the others as its complement, and all so arranged that the absence of any one is seen in the manifest imperfection of the system.

Having embraced certain fundamental truths of the Gospel—if indeed he has embraced them with his heart—he will not rest until he has discovered the whole sisterhood of Christian doctrines. The exercise of a living faith in any one truth of revelation, involves that doing of the will of God, to which the promise—"he shall know of the doctrine"—is made.

Of this discourse we can say without qualification that it compares favorably in point of ability with the best productions of the American pulpit. In truthfulness it excels many sermons of louder pretensions to orthodoxy, abounding with free, earnest and profound thoughts, and containing but little, from which we are obliged entirely to dissent.

The title indicates the author's plan. He treats of the Church, first, historically; then, critically; then, prospectively.

He passes in review the origin of the Christian church, its organization, and the corruption which succeeded the primitive age.

We have room for a single extract only, on one of these points.

"The organization of the early church was partly adopted from that of the Jewish synagogue worship, and was partly originated as any necessity occasioned it."—p. 8.

"We see, in this instance," (the election of the seven deacons, Acts vi.) "how gradually the organization of the early Church arose. It was not fixed immutably from the first in canons and rubrics by the apostles—but each part of it came when it was wanted, and was based on the reason of each particular case, and was confirmed by the assent of the whole multitude.

"Such was the Church of Christ at first—simple in its organization, noble in

its aim, full of a profound life and an immense energy. Its only creed was faith in Christ. Its organization was flexible, enlarging as its wants were multiplied. It was a living, loving, and working Church."—p. 9.

Coming down to our own times, he speaks of the two main tendencies which "have resulted from the divisions of Protestantism, one a backward tendency toward Romanism, the other a forward tendency toward a greater individualism." The tendency toward Romanism, he regards "as only an eddy in the stream of the church's progress;" and the tendency to a greater individualism he ascribes to the indifference of the church to the claims of humanity.

In the last division of his discourse, Mr. Clarke treats of the elements of the church of the future. He believes that the church is to be what it *ought* to be; and this church in his opinion will take "into itself as independent but harmonizing elements all the tendencies which now appear embodied in different sects." Each sect will recognize in others some qualities in which it is itself deficient; and they will all come together on the broad ground of a common Christianity without requiring of each other a concession or compromise of their particular ideas. Guided by this spirit, he thinks, the future church will receive into itself the three leading parties of his own community—the Orthodox, the Unitarians, and the Spiritualists. Having stated in a passage which we have already quoted, page 418, what orthodoxy has in which Unitarians are deficient, he speaks in the following terms, of what he pronounces to be the defects of orthodoxy—defects which he thinks the Unitarian movement was sent to supply:

"Orthodoxy undervalues man's nature and capacities; exalting the Son, it does not worship the Father; it does not see God in Nature, God in History, God in Providence. It creates a fervent piety,

but is deficient in conscientiousness, in truthfulness, in a regard for man as man. Unitarianism, with all its defects, can teach Orthodoxy a lesson. If it learns of Orthodoxy to see God in Christ, it may teach it to see *men in Christ*. It may teach it humanity while it learns piety, may teach it conscientiousness while it learns penitence and faith. And if that seems a small matter, remember that Christianity did not differ from previous religions by creating a more fervent piety so much as in creating a deeper and purer humanity."—pp. 21, 22.

He then declares, that the Transcendental or Spiritual movement of our day must be received by the comprehensive church of the future.

"It will be received, not for its denials or negations, but for its noble sight of an infinite worth in man, of a divine power in the human soul. Man, trampled into the earth by the crushing heel of the tyrant, is lifted up and placed a little lower than the angels as soon as God's ideas are found in him. That God is now in the world, that he is ready to inspire us by his Spirit, that he is uniformly near, the light within us, the life of our life—these are the teachings of transcendentalism, for the sake of which we can easily overlook its extravagant opposition to miracles, and what seems to me its unreasonable denial of the supernatural element in history."—p. 22.

All these classes of professed Christians Mr. Clarke expects will yet stand together on a common platform; and that platform he declares to be, faith in Jesus as the Master.

We have thus put our readers in possession of the main ideas of this able discourse. We have abstained from criticism, intending to present our own views on the leading topics, from which it will be seen how far they accord with those of the author, and in what respects we differ from him.

We are particularly pleased with his views of the origin and organization of the Christian church. We hold with him, that when the church came, "it came as a necessity. The Apostles and disciples did not found a church, but found themselves in a church. They were driven together by outward persecution—they

were drawn together by an inward impulse." Of course the church exists as a necessary form of Christianity—agreeably to the expectation and will of the Master. It is a brotherhood, united by a common faith, by common attachments, by common hopes and aims—in one word, by a common character, a spirit of obedience to God. We are, therefore, not to look into the New Testament for ecclesiastical canons. The only rules of church order are the PRINCIPLES of CHRISTIANITY, the binding force of which extends to the church just as it extends to all human relations. These principles are comprehended under the general terms, liberty, equality, fraternity. Every member of the association is to be the judge of his own duty, and to be free in the profession and practice of his faith. Every member is to be equal to every other, precisely like the citizens of a Republic; and the rights of office are likewise to be conferred by popular vote, and held subject to the will of the community. Every member is to be a brother—as a brother to give and receive advice and admonition—as a brother to bear his part of the common burdens—as a brother to promote the common good and the good of each individual in particular. These principles are a sufficient guide in ecclesiastical matters. Any rules or by-laws, not inconsistent with them, may be lawfully adopted. These principles were regarded in the first organization of the church, "each part of which came when it was wanted, and was based on the reason of each particular case, and was confirmed by the assent of the whole multitude." They would have been disregarded and transgressed, if, as in after ages, the church had been constituted with a hierarchy, invested with the supreme legislative and executive power. For such a constitution conflicts with all these principles, being utterly subversive of

liberty, equality and fraternity—divesting the Christian, not of rights conferred by rubrics and canons, for none such were known in the Apostolic church, but of liberty to serve God, as a free and equal member of the Christian family.

Every other view of the constitution of the Christian church, is sectarian and exclusive; this is catholic and comprehensive. It leaves each association of believers to follow its own sense of duty in respect to discipline and government, with no other authoritative guide than the nature of Christianity itself. It recognizes every such association, formed for the observance of Christian ordinances, as a visible church of Christ, whatever may be its particular organization—whether its government is lay or clerical; whether monarchical, aristocratic or popular. While it maintains, that the organization of the church ought to be conformed to the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, it does not pronounce a different organization fatal to the being of a church. It is not indispensable to the existence of a church, that the members composing it should be a free and equal brotherhood. A church does not cease to be a church by being divested of some of its rights.

This view of the church of the future admits and encourages the intercourse of the various local churches of all truly Christian sects. The interchange of ministerial services, fellowship in the ordinances of the gospel, mutual advice and admonition, sympathy and assistance in distress, with tokens of respect for the opinions of sister churches; all indeed that constitutes the visible communion of saints, both between individuals and churches; are provided for in this platform.

If these views of the church "as it ought to be" are sound, the "new birth" is indispensable to every step of progress toward its realization.

To just the extent in which the work of human renovation by faith in Christ, advances, in the sects and in the world, will the way be prepared for the church of the future. But the piety of that day must be of a higher order than is common among us, characterized by larger views of truth and by a quick discernment and cordial recognition of the lineaments of the divine image in whomsoever they may appear. That true liberality of mind which receives cordially "him that is weak in the faith," because he is in the faith, notwithstanding his errors and imperfections, must reign in all the sects before the universal visible church can enter into the world. But in the meantime every new convert to this truly Christian Catholicism will, as a drop in the ocean, supply a part of the grand result.

We concur also in our Author's views of the Christian ministry as we understand them.

"I think," he says, "that in the Future Church the *distinction between clergy and laity will altogether cease*, for this distinction does not belong to Christianity, but was imported into it from Judaism. In the early Church all were clergy and all laity, all priests and all people. By one spirit all had been baptized into one body, and no clerical order is intimated. The Church had its officers as any association must, but these officers did not form a class or clergy. The Clergy-Church must be changed into the Church of the People, before the members can feel their individual responsibility for the total action of the body. The ministry, worship, and preaching will remain, but the Church will not be built on the ministry but the ministry on the Church."

This is very true, and very important to the establishment of the church universal upon the basis of liberty, equality and fraternity.

It was manifestly the intention of Christ that his Gospel should be spread over the world by "the foolishness of preaching." At first every disciple was a preacher. Many who had no office in the church, were endowed with the spirit of prophecy, or inspired with a preter-

natural ability to instruct and exhort their fellow worshipers. Apostles and Evangelists, or traveling preachers, were divinely commissioned, or chosen by others, to preach the gospel to the unevangelized. It was deemed a matter of importance in the local churches, that the elders, or executive officers, should also be distinguished by their ability to teach the people. This was rather a desirable than an indispensable qualification for their office, because the functions of ruling and teaching when discharged with ability by the same person, had on that account more weight and efficacy.

In the course of time the offices of teaching and ruling became indissolubly connected. The age of miraculous gifts passed away, and the necessity arose of a ministry officially devoted to the work of preaching the word. The mental discipline of education, and a careful study of the Scriptures, were now required to supply the place of inspiration; and as the preacher could no longer rely on a direct efflatus of the Spirit, he could adequately inculcate the will of God, only by giving himself wholly to the work. The Christian ministry is, therefore, a body of men set apart to the work of preaching the Gospel, in accordance with the same law of want and necessity which gave existence to the deaconship, for a time to the office of deaconess, and to every other part of the church's organization. Our Author therefore well says, that "the ministry, worship and preaching will remain" in the church of the future. But as in primitive times, "the church will not be built on the ministry, but the ministry on the church." The ministry will exist for the church; not the church for the ministry. The church will have ministers because she needs them for her own growth in knowledge and holiness, and for the work of evangelizing the world. Christian ministers will as pasto-

have official authority, as did the elders of the primitive Church; and as preachers, they will have great personal influence, corresponding with the purity of their lives, and the ability and faithfulness of their public instructions. But they will not be lords over God's heritage. They will neither have the power nor the disposition to legislate for the church. They will have the spirit which animated the Apostles when they called for the election of officers to take charge of the charities of the church, so that they might give themselves wholly to the preaching of the word. They will see, as in civil affairs the nations seem likely to learn after the sad experience of centuries of mis-government, that the peace and prosperity of the people demand that they should be governed agreeably to the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity.

We may pass over the division of the discourse which relates to the church as it is, with the single remark, that we believe the Author has conceded too much to the prejudices of the "religious men" who "think that churches are of no use; that they rather hinder than help the cause of humanity." He admits that there is too much foundation for this charge, and accounts for it by saying that "the church, in past times, has thought its especial business to be to promote piety, not to promote humanity." We should say, that both the piety and humanity of the church have hitherto been too defective and too feeble to produce the proper effects of Christianity. It is not a want of just views of the nature of religion, as consisting in the love of man as well as of God, but the feebleness of love itself, to which these sad practical delinquencies are to be ascribed. So far as our observation has extended we have found piety and humanity, the love of God and man, united, far more frequently than separate.

There are it is true a few noisy reformers in New England, not connected with the visible church; but in the late movements, as well as in all previous measures for meliorating the condition of man, the Christian ministry and Church have furnished nine-tenths of the effective influence. Who are the advocates of temperance, of peace, and of freedom, on whom reliance is chiefly to be placed for self-denying efforts in their behalf? A few men of no religious faith, like Jefferson and Franklin, and some of our own day, are entitled to gratitude for their sacrifices for humanity. But what, we ask, would become of the cause of human improvement, if it were left, without the aid of the church, to the sole advocacy of those who denounce that body as the bulwark of war and slavery, and every other time-honored abuse? We think but one answer can be given to this question. Many members of the church have doubtless given too much occasion for the charge of inhumanity—but the world *without* is far more deserving of the charge. The church is a city set upon a hill; and all her defects are at once visible. Her professions make her inconsistencies more glaring. But with all her faults, she is the only hope of the world.

We do not accord in every respect with our author's views of the church of the future. This church, he thinks, will admit of variety in its rites and forms; some parts of it observing the simplicity of the Quaker and others the most imposing rituals. He thinks, however, that the distinction between clergy and laity will entirely cease, and that the clergy-church will be changed into the church of the people. He does not expect that the sects will all be merged in one; nor that they will unite on any narrow ground, or upon any compromise or concession of their particular ideas. He thinks, if we under-

stand him, that all the sects of to-day will continue to exist, holding their peculiarities, but regarding each other as entitled to respect and brotherly affection, and forming together one church universal, bound by no other tie than a common faith in Christ, but living in actual fellowship in Christian privileges and co-operating in all benevolent enterprises. In accordance with these views, he expects to see the Orthodox, the Unitarians, and the Spiritualists, all in close fellowship, on the basis of a single article. "Faith in Christ," he says, "is the bond of union—the one article of the church's creed." No matter what else is professed; no matter how this is understood; whoever "accepts Christ as the Master, stands on the foundation, and is within the limits of the true church."

How far we dissent from these views, in which we concur in part, will appear upon a brief statement of our own views. We use the word church, to denote (1) the whole body of true Christians; (2) all who appear to be Christians; and (3) any body credibly professing faith in Christ, associated for the observance of Christian ordinances. In the first case it denotes the universal invisible church; in the second, the universal visible church—both of which are unorganized bodies—and in the third case, an organized society, the members of which are in express covenant with each other, on the basis of a common creed. We hold that the universal visible church embraces all who in any way make themselves known as the disciples of Christ, notwithstanding they may differ from each other in many important points, and may not be enrolled in any local church. He is a member of this church who makes himself appear to other Christians, to be a Christian. As such he is entitled to certain privileges; to be recognised by his brethren as a Christian, and

to be received to their communion at the table of Christ. Believing him to be a Christian, they have no right, on any pretence, to treat him as an infidel. It is only on the ground of such heterodoxy in faith, or of such unchristian conduct, as destroys their confidence in his piety, that they can lawfully debar him from the table of Christ. He is not entitled to be received, as our author may be understood to teach, merely because he professes faith in Christ, but, if at all, because he shows himself by some satisfactory marks, to be a true believer in Christ—a truly regenerate person—penitent and obedient. He may be lawfully rejected if he professes the highest style of orthodoxy, with no better evidence of Christian character. The only question is, Is he a true Christian.

The reader will now be able to comprehend our idea of the church of the future. It is the universal visible church—the unorganized aggregate of all open confessors of Christ, in mutual fellowship—tenderly respecting each others' differences—co-operating in every labor of humanity and love—and gradually assimilating more and more toward unity in faith and practice. The points in which they differ may continue, at least for a time, to arrange them in independent and dissimilar organizations, but these differences will no longer disturb their harmony, and the tendency will constantly be to throw what is trivial more and more into the shade, and to correct the serious errors of all parties.

It will be seen from these remarks that we reject the idea of a comprehensive church, having a creed made up of patches from the systems of all the different sects. The idea that each sect is a special providence, designed to supply some deficiency in the other sects, seems to us fanciful enough to challenge the easiest credulity—too fanciful to

be gravely put forth as a probability. It is true of sects, as it is of all things, that they exist by divine permission, for some sufficient reason; and the reason in a particular case may be the one alledged; but to affirm it as a general principle of the providential government of God, without the shadow of evidence, is preposterous. A becoming sense of our own liability to error, with a charitable respect for other Christians, will lead us to examine their opinions with candor, if possible to discover in them something in which we are deficient. This is the course which has been recommended in our pages, as fitted to enlarge the charity of all Christians, and ultimately to unite all in that universal, visible brotherhood of which we have spoken. But this has no resemblance to a church comprehensive enough to take in "all the tendencies which now appear embodied in the different sects." In our opinion the church of the future will comprehend as many of all sects, and of no sect, as are visibly true believers in Christ; and will exclude

all others of all sects. And the members of this church will not go to the sects for their creed, except as helps to the better understanding of the Bible, to which the final appeal will always be made. In that day, the Orthodox, the Unitarians, and the Spiritualists, whom our author expects to see in one fold, will not, one and all, be likely to retain the same creeds which now distinguish them; and even if they continue as they are unchanged, those only who show themselves to be "living epistles of Christ," will be recognized as belonging to the great household of faith, the universal visible church.

In thus intimating and perhaps showing a difference of opinion from our author, on some points, we are not sure that we fully understand him, or that he really expects or desires that Christians may become so latitudinarian as to embrace an eclectic system of doctrines, drawn from all the sects of Christendom. We would rather believe that his meaning is more accordant with the views of the subject expressed by us in this article.

#### CHURCH MUSIC.

It may be said in reference to all important subjects, theoretical and practical, that the neglect or violation of a single fundamental principle, will lead to disastrous consequences. Let us suppose in morals for instance, that in all extreme cases, the difference between falsehood and veracity, may be safely disregarded, and we undermine at once all the foundations of social happiness. Or let us in religion be governed more by inward impulses than by the written word; or let us be guided by the traditions of men or by the prevailing customs of society, to the neglect of a surer standard of duty, and we shall not fail

to be led into serious practical errors.

What if in the mechanic arts, we were to set aside the principle of the lever or the screw in our calculations? What would become of the whole system of modern astronomy, if we were to disregard the attraction of gravity? What if in literature we were to observe no distinction between history and romance? or in oratory, were to suppose no difference between dramatic personation and the life-giving appeals of forensic or pulpit eloquence? Any one mistake of the kind would serve to vitiate all our teachings in regard to the sub-

ject to which it should relate, and involve us in the mazes of practical error.

The discovery of such a mistake in reference to the subject of religious song, will enable us to understand more clearly what is required of us in regard to church music; and characterize with some certainty, the leading influences which are brought to bear upon this part of our public worship.

Whoever attentively compares the scriptural teachings in regard to the subject of praise, with what he usually notices in our religious assemblies, will not fail to be struck with the impropriety of the style. Praise, as it appears in the Scriptures, is a hallowed and delightful employment. It is the work of saints below, and the joy of angels and glorified spirits above. But praise in our religious assemblies is often a matter of frigid indifference on the one hand; and of unprofitable sentimentality on the other. The reading of a hymn from the pulpit secures devout attention; but when afterwards the same hymn is sung, the music either disturbs our meditations by its rudeness or inappropriateness, or it attracts towards itself a large measure of that attention which is due to the subject. How seldom do we realize in our experience, anything like that degree of devotional interest which the Scriptures warrant us in anticipating?

For this there must be some specific cause. What is it? We shall be referred perhaps to the low state of religion in the churches; to that low standard of piety which prevails among us. But if this were the true solution of the difficulty, might we not expect to witness a corresponding defect in public prayer? Praise and prayer, the Holy Scriptures teach us to regard as equally solemn and spiritual; but while the former has sadly degenerated—degenerated, we might al-

most say, to a mere piece of formalism—the latter retains much of its true character and influence.

Look for one moment at the elevated character of our consecrated themes of song—themes, many of which would tremble upon the lips of social prayer! Do we generally feel in song the full import of what we are uttering? Do we feel in any measure as Isaiah did, when we sing, “holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts?” Or when we exclaim—

“Let all the powers within me join  
In work and worship so divine,”  
do we really imagine ourselves to be speaking truth in devout sincerity as we do in prayer?

It has sometimes been urged, that a young and rising nation will not be given to musical pursuits like nations which are older. It should be remembered, however, that music in every other department of the art among us, is found to do its appropriate office. The music of the field, the parlor, the concert room, and the oratorio, is continually rising in interest and improving in quality. Even in the church we witness in many places, much artistic improvement, while in regard to spirituality, the delusion continues, and perhaps increases.

But, again, we are often told that there is much want of knowledge and discrimination—that ministers and leading members of the church treat the subject with neglect—that singers are of all people in the world, the most refractory and unmanageable. These things, however, are but the *result* of some specific cause—not that cause itself. The question returns: *Why* this deficiency in knowledge and discrimination, and this indifference to a subject of such moment? and why this contentious and unruly spirit in those who conduct the exercises of praise in Christian assemblies? The present age is not deficient in intellect, susceptibility, or practical dis-

cernment ; and there is nothing in the divinely constituted office of praise which should tempt us to the indulgence of ill temper.

There is one consideration which is adapted to throw much light on the subject. It is this : The nature of praise, compared with other religious exercises, embraces one remarkable, inherent peculiarity. It professes to associate intimately with the fervor of devotion, the pleasures of cultivated taste. Preaching and exhortation are clad in the manliness of plain and simple prose. Prayer employs a diction humble and subdued ; but praise as a special instrument of enforcing religious truth and guiding our heavenward aspirations, proposes to address us at once with the attractions of poetry, and the eloquence of impassioned song.

This striking peculiarity, intended by the Head of the Church, no doubt, as a means of quickening and elevating our devotions, becomes through human infirmity, the direct means of hindering them. The reason is, we seize upon the pleasures of taste as the principal object before us, and bestow upon that the exclusive labor of cultivation. The more these pleasures are heightened by art, without religious training, and the more attractive they become, the more they absorb our attention, even in the house of God, much as if we were sitting in a music room or a concert hall. This experience occasions disappointment to the more conscientious performers, who one by one desert the practice room and the choir, as affording no growth in grace and no religious enjoyment. And thus it happens that as the music becomes more artistic in character, it falls more entirely into the hands of those who are indifferent to the claims of spiritual religion. Such exclusive attention to art, while it defeats the wishes and expectations of the church, affords

peculiar gratification to the thoughtless, the gay, and the worldly ; who censure the church for its growing indifference to the subject.

This disappointment fatally discourages many devout minds. They cannot speak against the inherent excellence of religious song, without speaking against the Bible ; and are therefore silent. But they can act in accordance with their own painful experience, and imagine themselves justified in treating the subject for the rest of their lives with practical neglect. They perceive not the cause of failure ; and as a strange fatality seems to attend their efforts, they sink in discouragement and remain deaf to all questions respecting their responsibility. This state of things is often thought to admit of no explanation and no remedy.

But do we not perceive in these facts, the neglect of a most important principle ? Is it not an error that all our teachings and rehearsals of church music have reference to the *manner* without respect to the *spirit* of praise ? This spirit will not be found to spring up spontaneously in the midst of laborious drillings upon the rudiments of notation and style. The thing is impossible. As soon might we expect the true spirit of religious exhortation, to awake unbidden, in the class-room of the elocutionist, whose sole object should be to communicate by exercises upon sacred words, a knowledge of his favorite art. Every student in theology knows that the deadening influence of such exercises can be counteracted only by watchfulness and prayer. The exercises in themselves are useful—but their tendency is to cultivate oratory rather than produce unction—and if these were to constitute the chief preparation for the delivery of a sermon, they would not fail to drive the last vestiges of feeling from the pulpit.

The case is precisely the same in the ordinary practice of psalmody. The drillings upon tone, tune, time,

articulation, accent, emphasis and other things of the sort, which should have been mastered in childhood, are in our adult classes, so strongly and so constantly associated with the consecrated themes of song, as to form an almost indissoluble connexion. We are creatures of habit; and in this way, cannot fail, without the intervention of some other powerful agency, to bring these deadening influences and associations, directly into the solemn services of the sanctuary. Conscience may there plead for devotional feeling, but habit almost with the power of mechanical necessity, will lead to dissipation of thought.

But this is not all. The rehearsals which take place after a knowledge of the rudiments have been gained, must still maintain the drillings upon style; and the usual practice is to place before the singers that music chiefly which is new, complicated, and of a spirit-stirring character. This secures a more punctual attendance at the rehearsals, and a livelier interest in the exercises. If the drillings now are not so severe and constant as before, still the mind is no less absorbed in the music, through the difficulties and attractions which are presented; and though the sentiments should be derived from the sacred text, the attention is directed wholly to matters of taste and art, and not to such as lead the heart of the singer to communion with spiritual things.

In music, just as in oratory, there is an immense difference between a personated devotion and a devotion which is real and sincere. When the *prima donna* of the opera, kneels and assumes the language of supplication, no one ever considers her as actually engaged in prayer. Her attitude and expression may have a strong resemblance to that exercise; but her representation, morally speaking, has no more reference to real prayer than grave mimicry has to true devotion of soul. Nor will

the constant practice of such mimicry have the slightest tendency to promote a spirit of prayer. The tendency of course will be in the opposite direction.

Now the sentimentalities of which we speak as characterizing rehearsals of religious music, though not intended for such mimicry, are just as distinct from the real spirit of praise, as are those of the opera singer from the true spirit of prayer. We are not saying that these sentimentalities are necessarily wrong, or that they need always be suppressed. But we say that they are too exclusively artistical; and, that, not being in any sense devotional exercises, they are not means of promoting a spirit of praise. Their tendency is to histrionism, rather than to devotion. Music cultivated in this way with artistical success, has, to the initiated, many powerful attractions. Its influence is sometimes so great that neither the performers nor auditors can tell "what manner of spirit they are of." Persons thus circumstanced, learn at length to fix their minds so exclusively, even in hours of devotion, upon the charms of the music and poetry, as scarcely to leave room for any thing better than the mimic solemnity of musical enthusiasm. In a multitude of cases, however, these influences are not exerted, for the expression of the music is so at variance with the *religious* sentiments of the hymn as to savor more of the ambition of the practice-room, than of the solemnities of public worship.

We have generally a fair exhibition of church music in those places where there is some amount of cultivation. The examples of a better sort, though delightful in themselves and worthy of all commendation, are yet, we fear, comparatively speaking, but few and solitary, while those of a character far worse than we have described, are exceedingly numerous. The abuses in some

places have become so flagrant and mischievous as to sunder the bonds of religious society. In many instances, the members of an amateur choir, assume an attitude entirely independent of the pastor and church, refusing all advice or interference—a circumstance which leads many of the devoutest minds to despair of any remedy for these evils.

But there is a remedy. To deny it would be to call in question the wisdom of a divine ordinance. What if we were to say, there is no remedy for heartless preaching and exhortation; no remedy for the want of a spirit of prayer! This would be apologizing for sin. And shall we venture to say there is no remedy for heartlessness in the office of praise? There is a remedy which can be safely and successfully applied. We must call back into vigorous action, that long-neglected principle, to the disregard of which, most of the existing evils may be distinctly traced. Music for the church must be cultivated not chiefly as a fine art for the gratification of taste, but as the most impressive, impassioned enunciation or expression of the hallowed themes of song. Social merriment must be driven from our schools of church music, by the force of religious principle. Religious influences of a decided character, must prevail in our rehearsals. The real spirit of praise in its due connexion with poetic and musical taste must be religiously cultivated.

Let us not, however, be misunderstood. There will be of necessity, a wide difference between a school for improvement, and a meeting for social and religious worship. There must be industriously carried into the one, such drilling and criticism as could find no admission into the other. When juvenile instruction has been limited or superficial, the elements of notation and style must continue to occupy in adult classes, at least for a time, a large

share of attention, and the words of a psalm or hymn must here, as in schools of oratory, be often taken in hand for the special purpose of securing distinctness and propriety of utterance. And such is the low state of psalmody among us, that the most strenuous exertions of a teacher will be required to produce in the little time allotted him, any satisfactory amount of improvement: Nor is this all. The growing attention to musical science in the higher branches, and the consequent adoption of manuals of instruction which go more extensively and with more elaborate minuteness into the elements of the art, form to the teacher in his straitened circumstances, another source of necessary embarrassment. It would seem indeed as if all things were conspiring to increase the disproportionate amount of elemental drilling. It is admitted also, that beyond the period of rudimental exercises, there remains much to be done in the way of criticism and adaptation. There is of course no resting place in the progress of improvement. We cannot either pass onward or fall back from our present standard. Hence there is a strong and perpetual temptation to neglect the necessary religious training.

But is this temptation irresistible? And is it really necessary for us to "cast off fear and restrain prayer," and withhold the solemn offerings of thanksgiving and praise in our preparatory exercises in sacred music? And must all our drillings and criticisms have reference solely to the manner of song?

It is precisely at this point that the whole subject of improvement in church music labors. Our efforts towards improvement, have been too limited and too ill-directed. They have not only been feeble and fitful, but partial and one-sided. These faults might be avoided. The school and rehearsal might be opened and closed with prayer. Favored

moments might be found for meditation on the words of the psalm or hymn. Some comments on their meaning might be briefly given, and constant instruction in respect to the emotions to be expressed. Whatever else in devotional music may be allowed to suffer, these are the "weightier matters of the law," the neglect of which will inevitably be fatal to its highest excellence and effect.

It is not the *amount* of elemental training and of criticism that we complain of, for in many respects there is need of more. But we speak of that *exclusiveness* and *disproportion* which are almost every where seen to prevail,—and for this we know of no sufficient apology. Schools should be longer continued, and rehearsals more faithfully and constantly sustained—and if this is impossible, a part of the time which is now devoted to the difficulties of execution, should be employed in direct reference to the spirit of praise. This *must be done*. There must be a direct and specific training of the religious affections in our schools and rehearsals of church music.

Here we take our stand. Let the one long-neglected and forgotten principle, in regard to the spirit of praise, be restored to its legitimate rank and influence. Let the training be no longer one-sided or disproportional,—and in this respect, let us take the Scriptures with enlightened Christian experience for our guide. Let us learn to pursue the study and practice of sacred music, intelligently, with a truly devotional spirit; and then the abuses of which we complain will gradually disappear. Already this experiment is in successful operation in a few favored places, and promises permanent results.

But without enlarging on this part of our subject; we invite attention to the influence of oratorios and other musical performances upon the interests of church music. The

oratorio is a high-wrought dramatical composition, founded usually upon some inviting portion of Scripture history. While the words are thus sacred; the music is so ordered, as to produce a public entertainment of the most attractive kind. The composer tasks himself to the utmost, to bring forth rich materials of every sort for a musical feast. The idea of worship in the evangelical sense is never thought of. The histrionic principle prevails here as entirely as in the opera—and all the arrangements for rehearsal and performance, are in keeping with the leading object in view. Much talent in execution is here indispensable. Ordinary singers of a choir are engaged for the fitting up of a chorus or double-chorus, but the recitatives, airs and *soli* movements can be well sustained only by professional talent of a high order; and this will not always be drawn from sources the most desirable. A similar remark may also be made in reference to an orchestra. Talent must be enlisted, however, if it is to be obtained. This circumstance brings together such strange mixtures of society, at the rehearsals, as would prevent the maintenance of religious order, even if such a thing were thought to be desirable. The frequent practice is, to rehearse, with the most solemn words, in an artistic way, in the midst of mental exhilaration and thoughtless mirth. Even such rehearsals often lead to performances, in which the music is truly imposing and delightful—but how are the members of our choirs affected by such a species of training? Can we here discover any conservative influences, in reference to *devotional* singing? No one will pretend this. The tendencies are in a different direction. Let a well trained choir be engaged in such exercises for any length of time; and their spirituality on the Sabbath will be seen to have diminished. Oratorios,

it is true, are the pride of the art. They form a necessary part of the library of the musical student. In this point of view they are like the classics in literature. Nor would we by any means undervalue the musical achievements of those who devote themselves to the practice of such music. But to the singers of a choir, we say the tendencies are histrionic and not devotional. We must look steadily in another direction, if we are to recover in psalmody, the right spirit and influence.

When concerts of sacred music are made up of oratorial extracts, anthems and motets, they are very liable to exert the kind of influence which has just been described. Public entertainments of religious music, when the great themes of salvation are habitually uttered for entertainment, without any reference to true religious impressions, either upon performers or auditors, are always injurious. Much less can those concerts of a mixed character, embracing anthems and amatory songs, be tolerated with Christian propriety. Their tendency has ever been prejudicial to the cause of church music. But the case is different on those occasions where sacred subjects can be treated with becoming reverence. And here Christian experience, where there is sufficient watchfulness, will enable us to make right decisions. Beyond a certain point, however, these performances will not prove beneficial. The strongest tendencies are artistic; and we can never cure the habits of ostentation, by the indulgence of public display. What if ministers of the gospel were frequently to deliver their sermons and religious lectures before a promiscuous auditory for the mere gratification of a passion for oratory? The tendency to desecration would be unspeakable. And can a similar thing be habitually done in song without danger.

Quartette choirs of hired singers

are subject to strong temptations. The voices heard, individually, as at a public concert, will of necessity reveal every excellence and defect in such a manner, as to invite commendation or censure from the *amateurs* below. The *criticisms* may be fickle, fastidious and severe —nevertheless, the demands of *taste* must be met. The choir must give satisfaction to their employers or be driven out of place. To maintain devotional feeling, they will therefore need strong religious principle, and thorough discipline in the school of Christ.

We shall not stop to reason with those who make no distinction as to responsibility between human beings and the pipes of the organ: As surely as the Bible is to be our guide, those who lead our devotions are themselves bound to be devout. Besides, if a congregation are to be edified, they must occasionally unite their own voices in song; and in this case they will need a greater number of leading singers. For these reasons, the experiment of quartette choirs in evangelical congregations will doubtless be soon relinquished. Larger choirs are not liable to the same objection; for the comingling of many voices offers less inducements to individual criticism.

Parlor melodies, glees, and the various species of instrumental music, need no commendation from us. They have already spoken sufficiently to the public ear, in their own behalf; and the general fondness for them is every where increasing. So far as the present discussion is concerned, we may regard their influence on church music, somewhat in the light of the current literature which, with here and there an exception, soon passes and is forgotten. Amidst the teeming multitude of literary publications, we need the greatest care and judgment in selection; for an indiscriminate indulgence in reading must ever tend to mental dissipation.

and imbecility. The same is true in secular music. There is a great choice in pieces, in respect to character and influence. Pieces of the better sort may become a source of high enjoyment in hours of weariness or relaxation. But the indulgence of an exclusive passion for secular music is scarcely consistent with excellence in religious song. The importance of this consideration seems not to be sufficiently understood; especially in those Christian families where years of instruction and practice are devoted to the secular department, to the almost entire neglect of sacred music.

We can not take leave of the subject of church music without offering a single suggestion to the educated classes of the community. If what we have said is true, it will readily be seen that much remains to be done which can not safely be entrusted either to thoughtless youth or to men of one idea. Other appliances than those of an artistic nature must be brought to bear upon the subject. A general knowledge of rhetoric, oratory and mental phi-

losophy, as well as a deep acquaintance with religious experience, will be found indispensable to success in that kind of training which is demanded. Zeal, susceptibility and enterprise are, to some extent, already enlisted in the cause—but there is need of more intelligence, religious principle and weight of character, to secure the right direction and the right issue. The work to be done can not be postponed; for counteracting forces are now in action, that will not easily be impeded. The present is on the whole the most favorable period we have ever known for redeeming the character of religious music, and placing it upon a just basis. But the work will not be accomplished without an effort,—and the favorable opportunity may soon pass.

We commend the subject, therefore, to the immediate and earnest attention of those friends of religion who have intelligence and taste to discern the imperfections of our church music, and ability to apply the remedy.

#### THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1848.

SINCE the issue of our last number, events have transpired in Europe which will make the year of our Lord 1848 an era in history. The suppressed popular agitation in England and Ireland, which in ordinary times would absorb our interest, has been quite distanced in public regard by the mighty movements on the continent. France, the Papal States, Naples, Sicily, Tuscany, Parma, Placentia, Modena, Lucca, Venice, Lombardy, Austria, Prussia, have been tossed on the billows of popular commotion or civil revolution. And in these States, as also in some others where the popular movement has been less

violent or has been anticipated by concessions from the rulers—as in many of the smaller States of Germany and in the Netherlands—steps have been taken, within a few months, which, if they shall be rightly maintained, if there shall be no retrogression toward arbitrary rule, and no diversion toward popular anarchy, will accomplish more, for civil and religious freedom and the vast human interests dependent upon it, than has been accomplished in a previous century.

We shall not attempt within the brief limits of this article to survey the recent changes in all those countries. It will be better to con-

fix our attention to the late movements in that nation which more than all others is an object of present interest—interest at once hopeful and fearful, joyful and painful—to France.

There, a monarch, every where celebrated for his shrewdness and ability in government, who had long been seeking to establish his throne and the legitimacy of his family, who had rendered his capital the most strongly fortified city in the world, who had within call 200,000 troops, with a strong majority of the national legislature to support him, has been driven from his throne and realm, a disguised fugitive, seeking protection in a foreign land—and that in two or three days, almost without bloodshed, and with nearly as little violence as occurs in one of our presidential elections.

Amid the growing dissatisfaction and agitation of the nation, in consequence of the great burdens imposed by his selfish plans, the unconstitutional restrictions on liberty, and the enormous bribery revealed in various departments of his government, he relied with confidence upon his strong defences and numerous army; but was awakened from his fancied security by the sudden development of sympathy and alliance between the whole army and the offended people. It was as though a foundation of rock beneath his feet had suddenly changed into an engulfing sea. What then did all the fortifications, on which, for the selfish interests of family, he had squandered the resources of an overtaxed and straitened nation, avail him, without soldiers to man them; yea, with soldiers to man them against himself? In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, the monarch of thirty-five millions of people, and the commander of an army of four hundred thousand soldiers, became as weak as any other man; a fact most portentously instructive to all earthly monarchs,

teaching them that popular sympathy in their armies (to which the army is very liable, and will be more and more, in any country where there is any general diffusion of knowledge) may render the sole support on which they lean “a reed, a spear.”

The monarchy being overturned, a temporary or provisional government was constituted by acclamation and general consent. That provisional government proclaimed as their motto, “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,” similar in meaning to the famous phrase in our Declaration of Independence; and ordered an election of a National Assembly of nine hundred members, for the formation of such a constitution, or ordinance of government, as it shall thereby appear the nation desires—an election ordered on the broadest basis of republican rights or privileges—an election in which every man, of suitable age and unconvicted of crime, was invited to vote.

That election has taken place. The elected members have met and organized themselves into a National Assembly. And to that Assembly as the embodied sovereignty of the people of France, the provisional or revolutionary government have given their account, and resigned their office—an office which they have exercised, through great exigencies and embarrassing difficulties, usually with rare ability, and with remarkable success. We await with anxious interest the action of the National Assembly.

There are some living, who remember the receipt of the news of the first French Revolution, in the latter part of the last century; who remember the hope, the joy, the anxiety, gradually changed into fear and horror, as wave after wave of intelligence came from the scenes of anarchy and popular despotism, and at length military despotism and general European war, which that Revolution introduced. And all

have read of these things. So that there is in some minds, very naturally, a predominance of fear, as to the results of the present movement. And, on the other hand, there are many, having a strong conviction of the preëminent beneficence of real republican government, confiding in the capacity of civilized and enlightened nations to maintain it, and remembering moreover the comparatively quiet process, and the good results, of the second revolution—that of 1830—who have a predominance of hope, and feel at liberty greatly to rejoice, though they rejoice not without anxiety.

We will therefore, in a cursory manner, survey the grounds of hope on the one hand, and of fear on the other, respecting *the results of the present revolution in France*.

It may seem to some that any prediction regarding the future in France is hazardous. We might appear wiser, perhaps, should we take the safe course in respect to this subject adopted by most of our contemporaries, and deal with what has been rather than with what will be. But we are not ambitious of that infallibility which consists in attempting nothing; and we will not avoid a question of great and anxious interest from the fear that the future will not sustain our positions. Yet we shall take no positions which do not seem well grounded. There are data bearing on the general question of results now proposed, which are well worthy of consideration.

What reasons then are there to hope for good results?

It is quite common to think of the present revolution in connexion with the terrible revolution of the last century. But it is certainly more reasonable to think of it in connexion with the revolution of 1830, the results of which, though insufficient, all acknowledge to be good. There is, surely, far more similarity between France in 1848 and France in 1830, than between

France in 1848 and France in 1789. And what is hardly secondary in its bearing on the subject, there is far more similarity between the world in 1848 and the world in 1830, than between the world in 1848 and the world in 1789. It would seem that the fear and despair of those who think only or chiefly of the revolution of 1789, should be in a measure removed by the more reasonable employment of their thoughts on the revolution of 1830.

But as the first revolution is associated in the minds of men, more or less, with the present revolution, it may be well to take advantage of that fact, by presenting the reasons for hope of good results now, in the form of a *contrast*, in some few points, between that revolution and this.

1. That which occurs first in order is, that the French people had not then, as they have now, such an instructive example of warning as the revolution of 1789 presents. So fearful a lesson as that can not be in vain to the friends of liberty. It must be constantly before their eyes; teaching them where both their danger and their safety lie. It stands like a lofty beacon on the reefs, whereon they were dashed before—the rocks of popular excess and anarchy—bidding them beware of the danger. That lesson, as we have learned, is not in vain. Both the leaders and the people ponder it. The members of the late Provisional Government, and of the present Executive Committee of the National Assembly, gather wisdom from it. The leading member of that Government, Lamartine—the master spirit of the present movement, who, for sixty hours, sublimely rode, and ruled, and subdued that whirlwind of human passion—has often, in his speeches to the people, reminded them of the excesses of that first revolution, and of their terrible results. The very fact, then, from which some gather despair—

the fact of that first revolution, with its reign of terror, and subsequent military despotism—of itself, gives us ground of hope.

2. This revolution is strongly contrasted, thus far, with the first, in the temper and spirit of the people. Of the violence and sanguinary character of the first revolution, none need to be reminded. This, so far, has been remarkable, wonderful, (it would be in any country,) for the moderation, self-control and humanity of the people. That they, in their struggle to overthrow the throne of a perfidious and detested monarch—one who was put into power by the voice of the people and as the man of the people, a citizen king, and had proved false to his pledges respecting freedom, and had bent his policy and energy to render his dynasty absolute and independent of the nation—that the people, in their struggle to overthrow his throne, and in the flush of their triumph, should have shed so little blood, destroyed so little property, and been so free from the crimes and excesses to which such occasions prompt, is amazing, and augurs well for the future. One of the first movements of the Provisional or revolutionary Government was to proclaim that no man should suffer death for political offences—thus shutting up entirely, so far as such a law and example could do it, the way, which, in the first revolution, led to the atrocities of the guillotine; and thus, in the most effectual manner, exhorting the nation to a mild temper and gentle measures. Indeed, not only the leaders, but all the people, seemed to possess that republican spirit of human brotherhood, which is so well taught by that republican passage in the New Testament, God “hath made of one blood all men to dwell on the face of the earth.” Fraternity was not only on their lips, but controlled their conduct, and seemed to be the inspiring spirit of the whole movement. There may

have been much of sentimentalism and romance in it; and it may be transitory. But we may hope otherwise. The remark of one of the people to another, who, in the heat of the contest, grieved at the death of his brother by one of the National Guard, declared that he must kill one of the Guard in return—the remark, “Stop, if you should, you would only lose *another brother*,” was worthy even of an apostle, and was said by observers to be characteristic of the general feeling. The spirit, then, in which the revolution has been carried on thus far, is in strong contrast with the spirit of the first revolution, and is very hopeful.

3. Another, and a very important difference between that revolution and this is, that now, on the one hand, the other nations of Europe are not disposed to interfere, as they did then; and on the other hand, France adopts a pacific policy, and is disposed to commend republicanism to other nations by her example of well ordered freedom, and not, as then, to promote it by incendiary and military propagandism.

Any one who reads and reflects upon the history of those times, from the outbreak of that revolution in 1789 to the restoration of the Bourbons in 1815, can hardly avoid the conviction that the *foreign interference* was entirely wrong, and lamentably disastrous in its influence and results. If then France had been let alone (why should she not have been? who had a right to meddle with her? what right had the monarchies of Europe to dictate terms to her?) if France had then been let alone, in all probability the subsequent excesses and atrocities of the revolution would have been avoided, and the nation, generally, would have become quiet under the establishment of a constitutional monarchy, or perhaps of a republic.

But France was not let alone.

The monarchs of Europe with their counselors, jealous of any popular movement, jealous of anything recognizing and proclaiming the rights of the people, anxious to maintain universally in European countries the divine right of hereditary princes to govern or tyrannize as they please, over subjects who have no divine right except to obey—these monarchs, in an alliance, which, sooner or later, all joined, resolved to put down this enterprise of liberty in France ; and, at the head of their arrayed armies, upon her borders, menaced her with war, unless she submitted to their dictation in her internal affairs—a dictation which forbade the establishment of civil liberty. This was a step very disastrous to all Europe, but especially to France. It exasperated the revolutionists against all the royalists, as those who were allied with these foreign enemies and meddlers, as indeed many of them were, at home, and in other countries, whither not a few had fled, partly for the purpose of securing the military interposition of other European powers. It turned the revolution into a civil war, in which parties devoured one another in terrible succession. It greatly aggravated the chief source of embarrassment to the revolutionary government, viz. its financial difficulties, by preventing the return of social quiet, commercial confidence, and productive industry ; by drawing off her strong men from useful labor, to military life and fields of slaughter ; and by throwing on the already staggering nation the enormous financial burdens of a war with all Europe. Indeed, more than to any other cause, may the excesses and disasters of that revolution be traced to this foreign interference—to this selfish attempt of the throned ones of Europe to put down civil freedom, to crush beneath the tread of their armed and allied legions every spark of the idea that kings and nobles do not rule by divine

right, and that the many are not made for the few.\*

\* As we have sometimes heard this fact of foreign interference questioned and denied, it may be well to quote briefly, from some authorities.

No one will impute to Alison partiality to France, or an unfavorable disposition towards the allied powers. He says—

“ The rise of this terrible spirit (the democratic) destined to convulse the globe, excited the utmost alarm in all the European monarchies. From it sprang the bloody wars of the French Revolution, undertaken to crush the evil, but which at first tended only to extend it, by ingrafting on the energy of democratic ambition the power of military conquest.”—Vol. I, 157.

“ The error of the allied sovereigns, and it was one fraught with the most disastrous consequences, consisted in attacking France at the period of its highest exaltation, and thereby converting revolutionary phrensy into patriotic resistance, without following it up with such vigor as to crush the spirit which was thus awakened. France was beginning to be divided by the progress of the Revolution, when foreign invasion united it. \* \* \* The catastrophe of the 10th of August was in some degree owing to the imprudent advance and ruinous retreat of the Prussian army ; the friends of order at Paris were paralyzed by the danger of the national independence ; the supporters of the throne, ashamed of a cause which seemed leagued with the public enemies. \* \* \*

“ The fault of the aristocracy consisted in leaving their country in the period of its greatest agitation, and their sovereign in his extremest peril, to invoke the hazardous aid of foreign powers. Such a proceeding is always both criminal and dangerous ; criminal, because it is a base desertion of the first social duties ; dangerous, because success with such assistance produces perils as great as defeat. By striving to raise a crusade against French liberty, they put themselves in the predicament of having as much to fear from victory as defeat ; the first endangered the national independence, the last threatened the power and possessions of their order.—Vol. I, 131.

“ The object of the alliance is twofold. The first object concerns the rights of the dispossessed princes, and the dangers of the propagation of revolutionary principles ; the second, the maintenance of the fundamental principles of the French monarchy.—*Hardenburg, quoted by Alison*, p. 177.

Lamartine declares, that “ the classes dispossessed united themselves with the

The result to the other nations of Europe, was a series of sanguinary and devastating wars, destroying millions of lives, and creating enormous debts, which were entailed on their posterity, on whom they now lie, a crushing burden. In those wars, England subsidized a large part of Europe; and in so doing, contracted a large portion of that debt, which now, by necessitating taxation and restrictions on trade, grinds the faces of her poor, and produces an amount of misery and absolute starvation at which the heavens may well be desolate. In contemplating this war policy, which the English government adopted under the guidance of Pitt—a policy carried on by immense loans—we have often pondered the strong words of Robert Hall, and have been more and more deeply convinced of their truth. “Far be it from me to wish to withhold an atom of the praise justly due to him (Pitt). That he devoted much time and a considerable portion of talent to the affairs of his country is undeniable. The evils which he has brought upon us were not the production of an ordinary mind, nor the work of a day, nor done in sport; but what I contend for is, that, to say nothing of his unparalleled apostasy, his devotion to his country, and, what was worse, its devotion to him, have been the source of more calamity to this nation than any other event that has befallen it; and that the memory of Pitt will be identified in the recollection of posterity with accumulated taxes, augmented debt, extended pauperism, a debasement and prostration of the public mind, and a

system of policy, not only hostile to the cause of liberty at home, but prompt and eager to tread out every spark of liberty in Europe; in a word with all those images of terror and destruction which the name imports.”\*

But, now, so far as we can judge from present appearances, France will be let alone. This disturbing evil of foreign interference and general war, she will be spared. The monarchs of Europe are not disposed to meddle for the suppression of her freedom; or, if so disposed, they find enough to do to take care of their subjects at home. It is rather an anxious season for kings.

On the other hand, in the first revolution, France indulged a spirit and adopted a method, of republican propagandism, dangerous to the internal peace of the European monarchies. The National Convention declared by decree, in the name of the French nation, that it would grant fraternity and assistance to all people who wished to recover their liberty; and it charged the executive power to send the necessary orders to the generals, to give succor to such people, and to defend those citizens who had suffered, or might suffer, in the cause of liberty.

This, however, it ought in justice to be said, was not till after the alliance to put down French liberty by force, and after the actual invasion of France by the Allied Powers, for that purpose. It was a retaliatory course—a course which, probably, France would not have taken had she not been provoked to it by that unjust foreign interference.†

But, whatever may have been the cause, the French republic did enter with great enthusiasm upon the enterprise of extending democracy in

captive royalty and with jealous foreigners, to deny its revolution in France, and to reimpose upon it the monarchy, the aristocracy and the theocracy, by invasion.”

And Alison shows abundantly that Louis XVI. was in communication with the allied sovereigns respecting their interference for his relief, and counseled their movements.

\* Hall's works—Am. edit., Vol. II., p. 105.

† The process by which they came to adopt this course is seen in the following language, which we quote from a unanimous address to the throne by the As-

Europe, by force, and by alliance with the discontented subjects of the monarchies. It even went so far as to declare, that the French nation would treat as enemies the people, who, refusing, or renouncing, liberty and equality, were desirous of preserving their prince and privileged castes, or of entering into an accommodation with them.

But, now, France is indisposed to adopt, and there is no prospect that she will be provoked or driven to adopt, any such policy. On the contrary, her policy is that of peace. It is thus announced to all nations, by Lamartine, the minister of Foreign Affairs, in one of those State papers, which are unsurpassed in the felicitous combination of lucid statement, profound philosophy, and lofty eloquence. "War is not the principle of the French republic, as it became the fatal and glorious necessity of the republic in 1792. \*\* The sole interest of the consolidation and duration of the republic, would inspire, in the statesmen of France, the thoughts of peace. It is not the country that runs the greatest danger in the war; it is the liberty.

sembly, about a year previous to the decree of the Convention referred to above.

"No sooner did the Assembly cast their eyes on the state of the kingdom, than they perceived that the troubles which agitate it have their source in the criminal preparations of the French emigrants. Their audacity is supported by the German princes, who, forgetting the faith of treaties, openly encourage their armaments, and compel counter-preparations on our part, which absorb the sums destined to the liquidation of the debt. It is your province to put a stop to these evils, and hold to foreign powers the language befitting a king of the French. Tell them that, wherever preparations of war are carried on, there France beholds nothing but enemies; that we will religiously observe peace on our side; that we will respect their laws, their usages, their constitutions; but that, if they continue to favor the armaments destined against the French, France will bring into their bosoms, not fire and sword, but freedom. It is for them to calculate the consequences of such a wakening of their people."

—*Wilson*, Vol. I, p. 117.

War is almost always a dictatorship. Soldiers forget institutions for men. Thrones tempt the ambitious. Glory dazes patriotism. The prestige of a glorious name veils the attack upon the sovereignty of the nation. The republic desires glory, without doubt; but she wishes it for herself, and not for Caesars or Napoleons. \* \* \* She will not endeavor any immoderate or incendiary propaganda amongst her neighbors. She knows that there is no durable freedom but that which grows, of itself, on its own soil. But she will exercise, by the light of her ideas, by the spectacle of order and of peace which she hopes to give to the world, the sole and honest proselytism of esteem and sympathy. That is not war—it is nature. That is not the agitation of Europe—it is life. That is not to embroil the world—it is to shine from her place on the horizon of nations, to advance them and to guide them at the same time. We desire, for humanity, that the peace be preserved."

4. We have made allusion to the internal divisions of France in the first revolution. Here is another point of contrast too important to be omitted. Then, the nation was very far from union, indeed greatly distracted by factions. There were large classes, opposed in heart to the revolution, and especially to republicanism, particularly the nobility and their adherents, and a large part of the clergy and of the church of Rome. "In 1792," says Lamartine, "the nation was not one. Two nations (peuples) existed on the same soil. A terrible struggle still prolonged itself between the classes dispossessed of the privileges, and the classes who had just succeeded in achieving equality and liberty." The former, he states, conspired with the captive king and jealous foreign princes, against the revolution, and to restore the old condition of things. This, in

some measure, occasioned, certainly greatly aggravated, the excesses of the revolution. The revolutionists were possessed with the idea that liberty was unsafe, till all its enemies were destroyed. And this idea was called into sanguinary action, by one misguided republican after another, and one selfish demagogue after another, till multitudes of the best citizens of France and even of the truest friends of liberty poured out their blood under the guillotine.

But, now, so far as we have learned, the whole nation is remarkably united. Republicanism meets with little open opposition. All classes have given in their adhesion to the existing government, including the high officers of the church of Rome, and even some of the sons of the late king. There seems to be a universal conviction that the time has come, when republicanism must, at least, be tried. Even Louis Phillippe is said, as he left the shores of that realm, to have advised a friend who assisted his escape, to give his cordial support to the Republic, adding, "I have been the last king of France." From this internal union of judgment and feeling respecting free government, we may have strong hopes of good results.

5. There is another hopeful consideration which, however, though weighty, may be stated in a few words. Since 1789 there has been great progress in France, in popular intelligence, in just ideas of human rights and government, in the diffusion of property, and in religion. The Christian world is much older and wiser, France is older and wiser, than she was more than half a century since. The preceding revolutions have done much to prepare the French people for self-government, particularly by abolishing the laws of primogeniture and the entailment of estates, producing thus a wide diffusion of prop-

erty and of personal independence, by breaking up in a great measure the cumbrous and oppressive establishment of the Romish State religion, and by a general amelioration of government. Nor will it be without substantial profit to the French people that they have had, for more than fifty years, the example of our republic, and can study our history and institutions, and can model theirs after ours, in such respects as wisdom dictates.

6. We may hope much, moreover, from the *sincerity* and *consistency* of French republicanism.

The members of the late provisional government, who seem to be a fair representation of the general spirit of the people, made their proclamation of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," and have acted consistently therewith. They have not only given to every man, unconvicted of crime, a voice in the formation of the government which is so vitally to affect his interests, but they have declared, that negro slavery shall cease in their colonies; and this declaration has been sustained by the National Assembly. The French republicans give a *sincere* and *consistent* recognition of the "right" of "all men" "to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Theirs is real, sincere, democracy. Not that *hypocritical* democracy, (how intensely hypocritical) which, with one hand unfurls the flag inscribed with the declaration that all men are endowed by nature with the inalienable right to life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness, and, with the other, fastens the chains of slavery on three millions of men, and even contends, and, from the heights of official power, proclaims to the world, that slavery is the very corner stone of republican freedom. Not that *hypocritical* democracy which rants in the capitol of the nation about republican principles, and the creation of all men free and equal, and yet resists every effort to

suppress the traffic in human beings, and human bondage, all around that capitol, every effort to remove thence the slave pens, from which our fellow-men are often driven in chained and cuffed gangs, past the very temple of national freedom, to a merciless and distant bondage. Not that hypocritical democracy, which insists that every man over twenty-one years of age unconvicted of crime has, as a man, the right of suffrage, and yet withholds suffrage from all men with a dark colored skin. There is reason to fear that God will say to all such republicans, *wo unto you hypocrites*. And there is reason to hope, that in his love for sincerity and consistency and the spirit of human brotherhood, he will prosper the French people in their sincere and consistent republicanism.

But it is time that we turn to consider some of the reasons for fear respecting the results of the present movement in France.

1. The first and most obvious ground for fear is, that there may not be sufficient intelligence and virtue among the French people, for the purposes of political self-government.

Here, it must be acknowledged, there is reason for anxiety. Yet, as has been already remarked, there has been decided progress in these respects among the French people during the last fifty, and especially during the last eighteen, years. Besides, it may allay our anxiety, in some degree, to remember that republican government is maintained in such commonwealths as some of our southwestern States. If they are proved by experiment capable of republican government, we may well hope that France is. It is also a question quite worthy of consideration, whether a truly republican government is not the government, in which, better than in any other, the various selfish interests and passions will balance and regulate themselves.

There is on this subject of entrusting a people with freedom, a common fallacy respecting which we will quote the words of a writer, whose brilliancy leads many to overlook his profound political philosophy. "Many politicians of our time are in the habit of laying it down as a self-evident proposition, that no people ought to be free till they are fit to use their freedom. The maxim is worthy of the fool in the old story, who resolved not to go into the water till he had learned to swim! If men are to wait for liberty till they have become wise and good in slavery, they may indeed wait forever.

"There is only one cure for the evils which newly acquired freedom produces—and that cure is *freedom*. When a prisoner leaves his cell, he can not bear the light of day:—he is unable to discriminate colors, or to recognize faces. But the remedy is not to remand him into his dungeon, but to accustom him to the rays of the sun. The blaze of truth and liberty, may at first dazzle and bewilder nations which have become half blind in the house of bondage. But let them gaze on, and they will soon be able to bear it. In a few years men learn to reason. The extreme violence of opinions subsides. Hostile theories correct each other. The scattered elements of truth cease to conflict, and begin to coalesce. And at length a system of justice and order is educed out of chaos."\*

2. Fears have been expressed for France on account of the establishment of universal suffrage. It has not yet been proved by any experiment that it is not the safest and best method, to give the right of suffrage to every man of suitable age, who is unconvicted of crime. On the contrary, the light of experience seems to indicate that a government is most secure from overthrow,

\* Macaulay's *Miscellanies*.

when it stands on the broadest base—the extension of political rights to all citizens—when the whole people are its armed defense, and share by franchise in the national sovereignty. There is profound philosophy in the remark, made by Lamartine, when, resigning the temporary sovereignty of the Provisional Government into the hands of the National Assembly, he announced that that government had armed the whole people for the national defense, and had rendered the right of the citizen universal by rendering universal the right of suffrage—"Factions are no longer possible in a republic where there are no divisions between political and non-political citizens; between those who are armed, and those who are not. Every one has his right; every one has his weapon. In such a state of things insurrection is no longer the extreme right opposed to oppression; it would be a crime. He who would separate himself from the people, is no longer of the people."

One of the greatest difficulties in the republic of the first French revolution was, that it did not extend political rights to the masses of the people; was this very distinction between "political and non-political citizens." "In 1792," says Lamartine, "it was not the entire population who entered into the possession of the government. It was the middle classes only who wished to exercise liberty and enjoy it. The triumph of the middle class, at that time, was egotistical (selfish) as the triumph of every oligarchy must be. It wished to retain for itself the rights achieved for all. It was necessary for it to operate a strong diversion against the advance of the people, by precipitating it (the people) on the field of battle, in order to prevent it from entering into the exercise of government."

Thus, moreover, we may add, a constant struggle was kept up be-

tween the political and non-political citizens; as there ever will be in every government where that distinction exists, and so long as it exists. That effect will follow from that cause as surely as a weight will fall by gravity. We are inclined to think, that the extension of suffrage to the whole French people by the Provisional Government, was a measure of profound political wisdom. We may gather from it hope rather than fear.

3. Another ground of fear is the fact, that the question of the "organization of labor," as it is called, has had some part in the revolution; and that the government have been disposed, and have promised, to make some experiments on that subject. Here again undoubtedly is cause for anxiety. Thus far, however, the government have done nothing which should cause fear. They have merely established a few work-houses, and have expended a considerable amount in the wages of laborers needing employment and support—far less, however, than England expends constantly in sustaining her poor law system. Yet there is reason to fear that the late Provisional Government raised expectations which no government can satisfy—that they promised more than any government can perform, or at least more than a hungry people will be willing long to wait for. However, God sometimes leads nations to good results by paths to them very unpromising. Certainly it is very manifest to careful and candid observers, that there is a tendency, especially in populous countries and cities, to the excessive accumulation of capital in the hands of individuals, and to a corresponding depression of the laboring masses—a tendency, for the counteraction of which, it is very desirable that the principles of the gospel and the principles of republicanism should, in some way, be applied. In what way, is to many a very interesting

and important problem. And, perhaps, this problem, in the good providence of God, against the anxieties, fears, and protests of good men, is to be wrought out in France, just as God in his good providence led the older New England Commonwealths to complete religious liberty—to the entire separation of the church and state—to the entire abolition of the compulsory support of religion—against the anxieties, fears, protests, and prayers of a majority of the Christians in those commonwealths—a result which all now acknowledge to be good. Let us wait in hope, if not in faith.

We ought also to mention one other reason of anxiety which presents itself—the financial embarrassments of the government.

These, it ought to be remembered, have been produced, in the greater part, by the selfish extravagance of the overthrown dynasty. And as to the other part, it is nothing more than must temporarily result from that interruption of commercial confidence and productive industry which accompanies any fundamental change in government. That interruption will be only temporary. It is already passing away. And when quiet and confidence are again restored, the enterprise

and energy of a free people, and the economy and beneficence of a free government, will, doubtless, give to France greater financial prosperity than she has ever enjoyed. On this point, we shall do well to consider the financial embarrassments of the period during, and for years subsequent to, our own revolution, and the prosperity which has ensued.

On the whole our hopes greatly surpass our fears, respecting the French revolution of 1848, and constrain us to rejoice in it as an event of great promise for France. That church and state will be separated, and that a form of government, truly republican, will be established, and prosperously administered, we expect, though not with the greatest confidence. But, that the result will be a decided progress in civil and religious liberty and prosperity, we have no doubt whatever.

We have called this revolution an event of great promise for France. That promise is not for France only, but for all nations. Its influence—who can measure it? It goes on its way swift and resistless as the electric power. And its way—where will it end? Verily its line will go out through all the earth, and its words to the end of the world.

#### THE ETHICS OF THE RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE.

THERE is one grand topic in the science of duty to which neither Paley nor Wayland has assigned a chapter, and of which the "Christian Directory" of Baxter, the "Ductor Dubitantum" of Jeremy Taylor, and all the tomes of the more ancient casuists, take no notice. In no system of Ethics with which we are acquainted, in no collection or compilation of casuistry which

has come to our knowledge, is there any formal attempt to trace out and apply the principles by which a citizen in a republic should be guided in the exercise of his right of suffrage. How shall I give my vote in a popular election?—is a great question for conscientious men in these United States. It is a question which comes up not only once in four years at the election of a

President, but every two years at the election of Representatives in Congress, and every year once and again at the state and municipal elections. The question has been a practical question, of frequent recurrence, in Great Britain, ever since England had any rudiments of free institutions. It is now likely to become a question of the same kind of practical importance, in almost every country of Christendom. And yet, with the exception of here and there an occasional sermon by some New England preacher, who gets much censure for meddling with a theme so far beyond his province, we are not aware that any serious attempt has ever been made to define and exhibit the principles by which a free citizen should be guided in the performance of his high duty as a constituent member of the State.

It is not with the expectation of supplying so great a deficiency, that we have ventured to introduce the subject thus distinctly to public attention. It will be enough for us to throw out the few thoughts and inquiries which occur to us, and which may invite others to a more ample and exact discussion. In due time, we doubt not, the *Ethics of the Right of Suffrage* will be a distinct chapter in all systems of Ethical Science—a chapter without which no system can be recognized as complete in a free country. If our humble effort may contribute any thing to such a result, that is all we hope for.

I. We begin then by asking, Are the ethics of the right of suffrage defined and settled by any universal rule of the Christian religion laid down in the Scriptures? Is there any express rule in the Bible which will always show us how to vote in an election? We should hardly have thought of this question, if, we had not sometimes heard and seen Scripture quoted to show conclusively which of two or three tickets must

needs be preferred by all voters who recognize the authority of the Bible. The text which above all others has been used in this way, is a part of the advice which Jethro gave to Moses, [Ex. xviii, 21,]—“Thou shalt provide out of all the people, able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness, and place such over them to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens.” Doubtless this was good advice to Moses. That it may reasonably be regarded as advice divinely prompted, we will freely admit. That it contains principles which every conscientious man will spontaneously regard when called to give his vote or influence in a popular election, we will not for a moment question. But that it gives us a formula by which the individual voter must invariably be governed in the exercise of his right of suffrage, to the exclusion of all other considerations—that all doubts and difficulties that may arise in attempting to decide between different candidates of different parties and systems of policy, may be solved by the application of this formula—is what can not be made to appear. Such a thing as a popular election in a free commonwealth, where some thousands—or, as is the case with us every four years, some millions—of electors, are to determine by their votes, not only what men shall hold the reins of power, but what shall be the course and policy of the government,—is a thing which neither Jethro nor Moses had ever heard of, and to which no passage in the Old Testament or in the New makes any allusion. The case in reference to which the advice of Jethro was offered, was essentially different from the case of an individual elector in a republic. Moses had in his own hands the entire and exclusive power of appointment to office. Of course the question of his duty in relation to every appoint-

ment, was a question involving only a single element. In selecting a man for any particular office, he needed only to be satisfied as to the man's qualifications. Is he able?—is he firm in his allegiance to the national religion?—is he a man of integrity?—is he a man who will not be in danger of being moved from his duty by mercenary considerations?—has he these qualifications above any other man that can be thought of for such an office?—these were the only points which Moses had any occasion to consider in the exercise of his appointing power. But had he been merely one of twenty, or even one of a triumvirate, invested with the appointing power, then in every case of conferring an office, the question of his duty would have involved another element, and would have had some resemblance to the question respecting the duty of a voter in a popular election.

We remember another text which has been quoted and argued from, as showing how men must needs vote, who are governed by Christian principles. Paul, writing to the Christians at Philippi, and having expressed a confident hope that his life would be spared and that he would be again permitted to visit them, says, as represented by King James's translators, [Phil. i, 27,] "Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ; that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit," &c. The word translated "Let your conversation be," is *πολιτεύεσθε*,—which sounds somewhat like our English, or Anglo-American word, *politics*; and so, by an improved version, the text is made to read, "Only let your politics be as it becometh the gospel of Christ,"—that is, in the performance of all your civil and political duties, and especially in determining what party to vote with, as Christians. Without raising

any question touching the correctness of this improved translation, it is enough to say that the precept, after all, does not tell us what kind of politics—whether democratic, whig, or liberty-party—is such as becometh the gospel of Christ. As to the ethics of the right of suffrage, we are left to judge for ourselves by other light than that which this text affords us.

II. If then Christianity, in its authentic standards, prescribes no definite rule which can relieve us of the necessity of inquiring after the principles of duty in this matter, it is plain that the elector in exercising his right of suffrage, instead of depending on some divinely prescribed formula, must use his best discretion, just as every man must needs do in a thousand other questions which are referred to the decision of an enlightened moral sense. And we may suppose him to ask in the next place, "Am I bound to throw my ballot always for that man whom I judge to be the best man, without regard to any other consideration than that of his fitness for the office?" An affirmative answer to this question implies that the individual voter ought to act in all instances just as if he had an unlimited control over the election of the men who are to be entrusted with the functions of government. But does his duty require him—does it even permit him to act thus? Is not the fact that his right in the matter is the right, not of appointment, but only of suffrage, a fact that materially affects his duty? Is he not bound to take some notice of the known views and intentions of other electors? Is he not bound to consider beforehand what effect his vote is likely to have upon the result? May he not consult with others beforehand as to whom he and they can agree to vote for? Ought he not to do so? If he has one opinion as to the fittest man for the office, and others have a different opinion, may it not sometimes

be his duty to yield his opinion to theirs, and so to give his ballot for a man whom he does not regard as quite the best man. If he knows in advance that the best man—or the man whom he regards as such—can not be persuaded to accept the office, must he still vote for him? If he knows in advance that his best man can not be elected, must he still refuse to vote for any other man, be the certain consequences what they may? If it is perfectly understood that one or the other of two candidates will be elected, must he, under the conscientious necessity of voting at all hazards for the best man, give a vote which has no other tendency than to secure the election not only of a much inferior man, but, as the case may be, of the very worst man? Let the voter, instead of yielding blindly to an unauthorized formula, throw himself upon the guidance of his moral sense enlightened by the analysis of the case in which he is to act, and he will see that he is under responsibilities for which that formula makes no provision.

III. But our inquirer is not yet satisfied. He has other questions to propound. "Admitting that I am not required to give my ballot always for the one whom I regard as absolutely the best man, must I not at least vote always for one whom I regard as a good man? Is it right for me in any case to give my ballot for a man who is not only comparatively deficient but positively objectionable?" And this question takes a great many forms. One will ask, "Is it not palpably wrong to vote in any circumstances for a duellist, or for a Sabbath-breaker, or for one who speaks profanely?" Another asks, "Can I vote for a slaveholder without being a partaker in his sin?" Another asks, "Can I, in any case vote for a Roman Catholic?"—or, "Can I vote for a Unitarian?"—or, "Can I vote for a man who does not acknowledge the supreme authority of the Bible?"

Now in regard to questions of this class, nothing is plainer than that the considerations which they suggest are considerations deserving the most serious attention of every man who would exercise his right of suffrage according to the will of God. In many cases—in perhaps the majority of cases as they actually occur, no question involved in the election is paramount to the question of the personal character of the men who are to be entrusted with the various powers of government. There is a state election, we will suppose, just at hand; and you are inquiring how you shall exercise your right of suffrage. One or the other of two leading parties is sure to get the control of the state for the ensuing year. With one of these parties you have a general agreement of opinion, so far as questions purely political are concerned. Its success in the pending election will have the effect of advancing those views of a protective tariff, or those views of the best mode of keeping the public accounts, or those views of the banking system, which you regard as right. But that party has proposed as its candidate for the highest office in the state, a showy, windy demagogue, a man in whose personal integrity you have no confidence, a man whose influence in society is a corrupting influence, a man known as a despiser of the Sabbath and an enemy of religious institutions, a man whom, if he were your next door neighbor, you would not think of making the executor of your will and the guardian of your children. At the same time, the other party—erroneous as you esteem it in respect to the questions of public policy which are at issue—proposes as its candidate for the same office a man of the very highest and purest personal character. In such a case as this, the question of your duty is easily answered. What are the merely commercial or financial in-

terests, supposed to be involved in the election, when compared with the moral interest which the state has in the character of her own chief magistrate? In the view of every man who has any just moral sensibilities, the benefit which will result to the state from having in her highest place of honor a man who will honor the place instead of one who will dishonor it, exceeds by far any benefit which can be expected to arise from the success of your views on the political questions which divide the parties. Your moral sense, if you will but listen to it, tells you what to do. So in regard to all offices which the people confer directly or indirectly, and which may therefore be regarded as tokens of the people's favor. Principles of political economy—all the ordinary questions which are the ostensible division between political parties are of little consequence to the common welfare, in comparison with the influence which comes from the personal character of the men of whom it may be said, Behold the men whom the people delight to honor!

Yet it is not safe to say, without any qualification, that the conscientious elector may *never* vote for a candidate whose personal character is exceptionable. Nor is it safe to assert absolutely that there can be no case in which the elector may be bound in conscience to vote for that one of two candidates whose personal character is more exceptionable than the personal character of his competitor. There may be cases, in which the personal character of the man voted for is of far less moment than the questions of public policy, which are to be determined by the election. The duty of voting for men of unexceptionable private character, or even the duty of voting for the better man of two candidates instead of the worse man of the two, is not, like the duty of veracity, a simple and invariable obligation. No law of God revealed in the Scrip-

tures—no law of God revealed in the instinctive moral sense, gives us any such formula to be followed at all hazards. If we had such a formula, duly authenticated as from God, all consideration of consequences would be preposterous; the consequences would be God's, and to him alone would it belong to care for them. But having no such formula, we are bound to judge for ourselves what is right, in each of the innumerable complex cases that arise for our decision. It may happen that the question really at issue in a national election, is not simply whether this man who has never been concerned in a duel, or that man who has fought in duels, shall be president, but the far more momentous question between peace and war, or the equally momentous question between the extension of the area of freedom and the extension of the area of slavery. It may be that every vote given for the respectable gentleman who never puffed and never received a challenge—nay every vote not actually given for his exceptionable competitor, is in effect a vote for a system of measures which will involve the country in a most needless war and which will consign millions of men to the horrors of a life-long bondage. In some state elections, the question may be not simply whether some devout communicant in the Protestant Episcopal Church, or some Presbyterian elder, shall be elected governor in preference to a man who makes no religious profession or pretension, but whether that state shall commit itself for the abolition of slavery within its own jurisdiction. That religious man may have pledged himself against the fanaticism of attempting to abolish an institution which is sanctified in his eyes by its having had a place among the arrangements of Abraham's household; while that irreligious man with all his faults has become the leader in a bold and there-

fore hopeful effort to relieve his natural soil from a system which smites it as with a manifest curse from God. If you vote for that religious man—nay if you do not so vote that your ballot shall tell against him,—in other words if you do not vote for that man of no religious name or pretension—you vote in effect for the continuance of slavery. Is it not plain, that in such a case, you ought to vote for the candidate whose personal character you disapprove, and against the candidate whose personal character is unexceptionable.

We see then that the question to be decided by the votes of the people at an election, may sometimes have a moral significance by virtue of which it shall transcend all questions touching the personal qualifications of the several candidates before the people, as far as those questions of personal character transcend the ordinary questions of party politics. As the financial question between a high tariff of duties, and another tariff not so high, or that between one mode of keeping the public money and another, sinks into insignificance by the side of the moral question, whether such a man as Aaron Burr or such a man as John Jay shall receive the highest honors of the republic; so, on the other hand any ordinary question as to the personal qualities of one man in comparison with the personal qualities of another man, may sink into insignificance by the side of some great question of national morality and national destiny.

There is another thought in relation to questions of this class. Your suffrage is claimed for one candidate on the ground that he is an exemplary citizen—a Protestant Christian—a member of an evangelical church; but you have no sufficient evidence that his political abilities are such as are indispensable to a right management of the public affairs at the particular crisis which

seems to be impending. The only other candidate that can be reasonably thought of, is fully competent, you have no doubt of his ability; but he is a Roman Catholic, or he is a Unitarian, or he has been concerned in a duel, or there is some stain of immorality upon his character, though his career in public life gives you no reason to distrust his honesty as a man of business. If this man is not elected, the government is sure to fall into inexperienced and incapable hands. And yet the times are such that none but an experienced and able statesman can be trusted. A weak or incompetent man at the head of the republic in such times, might work great mischief with the best intentions. Look at the case then as it stands, and let your own moral sense tell you what you ought to do. It is well to have a pious physician; but you must have confidence in his knowledge and skill, or your conscience will not permit you to employ him in the hour of peril instead of that other physician of undoubted ability whose religious opinions are unsound. It is well to sail with a pious captain in command of the ship. But you are on a voyage, and it so happens that the ship's company are under the necessity of choosing some one to take command. Some of them are for choosing one whom you know to be a good man, and who is very useful among the sailors and the passengers as a religious man; but you have no confidence in his ability to command and navigate the vessel. Others are for choosing one who is no Christian at all and very little of a gentleman, but who is nevertheless a most experienced seaman, and of whose ability to control the crew and to bring the vessel into port you have no doubt. What kind of a conscience is that which would lead you in those circumstances to vote for the incompetent man because of his being a devout

man? Do you tell us that you will trust in God who ruleth the raging of the sea, and maketh the storm a calm? Do you tell us, from the Scripture, "He will give his angels charge over thee to keep thee?" Remember it is written again, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

IV. It may be thought that we are tending to conclusions quite coincident with the ordinary maxims of party politics. One and another may be ready to ask us, "Am I not right then in voting always for the regular nomination of my own party—no matter whom the party may nominate?" This is no doubt the first principle of what is called party discipline. The welfare of the country being the professed end, the success of the party is assumed to be the exclusive means; and in order that the party may be successful, every member of it must vote unfailingly for the "regular nomination," made out in conformity with what are called "the usages of the party." The nomination being once made, and "the ticket" having once been adopted as the symbol of the party, it must be voted for with an implicit submission to the authority from which it proceeds; he who holds back or hesitates—above all he who stands out in opposition—commits an offense never to be forgotten. Thus it is that thousands of intelligent men have no rule or principle in regard to the exercise of their elective franchise, but simply to follow the dictation of their party.

So far are we then from counseling you to follow your party, and to vote at their dictation let them nominate whom they may, that we would caution you against assuming that the success of your party is essential to the welfare of the country. It would even be safer to assume that the parties as they now exist are, one and all, essentially mischievous. Think what these parties are in their organization and

working. Who are "the party?" Who are they that make the nominations which you are bound to vote for? How is it in your own town or village? Are not the nominations for your local elections ordinarily made, if not always, by some little clique of leaders and runners, who call themselves the party? How is it that the nominations of the party are made for state and national elections? Whom do the conventions actually represent? By whom are the delegates appointed? Look at the conventions which have just been held; and say what was there in the getting up, in the composition, or in the proceedings of either convention, which ought to give any authority whatever to their respective nominations? You have more sympathy, perhaps, with one of those conventions than with the other; but what obligation is there on your conscience to follow the dictation of either.

It is worthy of serious consideration whether the complete disintegration of existing parties is not the very thing which the country needs, and which the country is now ripe for. What questions are at issue between the two great parties whose nominations for the presidency have just been presented to the country? There have been in other days great questions on which the parties were in opposition to each other. Four years ago, the immediate annexation of Texas, and the consequent war with Mexico, were depending, and were known to be depending on the result of the election. At the same time there were other issues between the parties—and particularly the question of protective duties. Eight years ago, there was not only the question of protective duties, but the question of the distribution of the funds accruing from the sales of public lands, and the question of what was called the independent treasury. Twelve years ago, the parties stood confronted on

the question of rechartering the Bank of the United States. But what question is there now between the convention which met in Baltimore and the convention which met in Philadelphia? What does either propose to do, which will not be done if the other party is successful? The annexation of Texas is a fact of history, and is no more to be disputed than the purchase of Louisiana. The war is at an end, the last formalities of ratification have been completed, and nobody proposes a renewal of hostilities. The existing tariff of duties will suffer no material change, whichever party may be in the ascendent, unless changes are found necessary for the increase of the revenue. No party will dare to encounter the strength of conviction with which the great doctrine of commercial freedom has wrought itself into the minds of the American people. There is no possibility, or thought, of creating a national bank; to charge such an intention on the whigs of the Philadelphia convention, would be as preposterous as to charge the democrats of the other convention with a design to dismantle the navy and to restore the gun-boats and the embargo. Whichever party may be in power, it will not venture on the establishment of any new fiscal institution, unless impelled by some hopeless confusion in the finances of the general government. The proceeds of the land sales are virtually mortgaged for the payment of the public debt created by annexation and our conquests and purchases of territory; and for the same reason all other questions about surplus revenue are pretty effectually disposed of, for at least two presidential terms to come. As for the improvement of the harbors and rivers of the West, and the opening of those great avenues of commerce which the West demands, neither party will do much before 1850; but after the census

of that year, the West will have whatever it may choose to demand. What is it then for which these parties are contending? Offices—offices—the spoils of victory—nothing in the world besides. The question who shall be president—involves not only the question who shall be the heads of the departments, but who shall be ambassadors and secretaries of legations, who shall be consuls and commissioners, who shall be clerks in the public offices and midshipmen in the navy, who shall be collectors and postmasters, who shall be tide-waiters and penny-posts. If the nominee of the Baltimore convention is elected, every appointment directly or indirectly in the gift of the general government is sure to be disposed of with a view to the interests of the party by which he has been elected; every functionary from the Secretary of State down to the veriest menial in a custom-house, will have his appointment either as a reward of party services already rendered, or as a stimulus to effort in the next campaign. If the nominee of the Philadelphia convention is elected, the least that can be anticipated is that every incumbent who has made himself obnoxious by efforts in behalf of a defeated candidate for the presidency, will be removed from office, and that every vacancy, however created, will be filled from among those who have been active in the canvass for "old Rough and Ready." Here then we see a great prize to be contended for. Here is the cohesive power that can agglomerate parties and hold them together, even when no great national interest, and no question of public policy is involved in the result. Nor is this all. If the democratic candidate is elected, the democratic party acquires new strength for the state and municipal elections; it will be able to elect senators and representatives in Congress; it will be able to elect governors and other state

officers ; it will be able to elect mayors and common-councilmen ; and, by its control over the appointing power, constables, justices of the peace, watchmen, and scavengers shall all hold their places in consideration of services rendered and to be rendered to the party. So on the other hand, if by the efforts of the whig party in the state of New York, the votes of the electoral college in that state shall be given to the candidate of the whig convention, and if those votes shall help to swell a triumphant majority for the "hero of Buena Vista," then it is reasonable to expect that the whig party in the state of New York will be strengthened in that triumph, and that the government of the state and perhaps of its great cities will be for a while in the hands of the whigs. The same might be said of Ohio or of Vermont or of any other state in which the whigs have any chance of being, in any circumstances, a majority. We see then what it is for which the parties are contending. Once they were divided upon questions of principle, or rather upon great questions of public policy ; and they contended for measures in which the welfare of the country was believed to be involved. Now they are contending only for offices—"the spoils of victory." Is not the complete disintegration of both these parties far more to be desired than the success of either ?

Nor is such a result beyond the range of probability. The great democratic party which came into power with President Jackson in 1829, and which from its organization in 1826 to the present hour, has never known but one defeat in a national election, gives many signs of dissolution. Of the men who were its fathers and guides, and to whose farsighted sagacity it has owed its successes, how many have committed themselves against the nomination of the Baltimore convention.

Vol. VI.

If it succeeds in this election, it may renew its vigor ; it may excommunicate the Van Burens and Cambrellings, the Butlers and the Nileses, and denounce them as "old federalists," and may be strong as ever after it has parted from them. If it fails in this election, it is dissolved as completely as the *old* democratic party was dissolved in 1824 ; and its elements must enter into new combinations. As for the whigs, nothing but defeat can hold them together. The candidate for whom they are expected to vote, is pledged to nothing definite, save that he will not be a party president. If, being elected, he redeems that pledge—if he refuses to dismiss honest and faithful functionaries for the sake of giving their places to the whigs—the party is of course dissolved ; and the wrath which came upon John Tyler will be forgotten in the curses, loud and deep, which disappointed office seekers will utter, against him. If, being elected, he fails to redeem that pledge—if all the offices of the federal government are divided, like the pillage of a captured city, among his hungry followers—that treachery will disgust thousands of patriotic minds, forcing them into other alliances founded on healthier affinities, and will thus dissolve the party which it seeks to serve.

Instead of saying then, according to what seems to be the grand principle of party politics, that every man should simply choose his party, and then vote invariably for the regular party nomination, we would rather say that sometimes it may be the duty of a citizen to cast his vote in just that way in which it will tend most effectually to the dissolution of existing parties.

V. But we may be told that, after all, we have done little towards simplifying the ethics of the right of suffrage. Of this we are as sensible as any of our readers can be. We can by no means undertake to give

a formula which shall supersede the necessity of careful inquiry and deliberation on the part of him who would do all his duty as a member of the national sovereignty. And if any man must needs have the one principle which shall include all possible instances of duty, we can give no rule that shall be narrower than this,—You are bound to vote just in that way in which your vote will tell most effectually for the true welfare of the country.

Let the terms of our proposition be fairly understood. We do not bid you regard exclusively the interests of your section, your state, or your particular department of industry. You are to care for the welfare of your whole country—not its gross material interests alone, its wealth, its power, its aggrandizement among the nations, but its *true* welfare. In the true welfare of a people are included not material elements alone, but all the intellectual and moral elements which belong to that people's life and history.

Observe again, we do not say you are bound to vote in that way in which you *think* your vote will be most effectual for the welfare of your country. We do not make the right and wrong in so grave a matter depend upon your erring and unstable thought. In this, as in all other cases, you are under obligation to do not merely what you think to be right, but what *is* right. If you think wrong, and vote accordingly, you will certainly vote wrong. True, when we can not see what is right, and therefore miss the right though earnestly aiming at it, God judges us according to our means of knowledge. But when it is in our power to see the right if we will look with calm deliberation in the fear of God; then if we err through carelessness or wilfulness or passion, God judges us not according to our actual knowledge, but according to our means of knowledge still.

Undoubtedly the questions submitted to popular decision at an election are sometimes too obscure or too complicated for the citizen to grapple with, unless he is endowed with more than ordinary reach of thought and more than ordinary means of information. On financial questions, and questions of political economy generally, the citizen may be mistaken without blame; just as every man may err without blame in the conduct of his private affairs. But more generally, the questions on which the people are to judge, have a moral aspect, in view of which an enlightened and unsophisticated moral sense pronounces an instant judgment. The moral sense habitually exercised—that promptness in the discernment of the right and wrong which results from the habit of doing right—is ordinarily the surest guide in the decision of questions which concern the public welfare. It is always safe to assume that what offends the unsophisticated moral sense is wrong; and that nothing inconsistent with the law of love can be incorporated into the policy of the government without bringing God's displeasure upon the nation. In relation to all such questions, every citizen is competent to judge for himself, and is bound to judge right. Let him give his vote then in that way in which his vote will tell most effectually for the welfare of his country.

“But what is my vote worth? How shall I cast it so that it shall tell upon the issue? Where shall I throw my little influence so that it shall be felt as an influence for good?” Let us look a moment at the elements concerned in the solution of this question. And for the sake of distinctness, we will suppose that the question relates to the specific exercise of the right of suffrage in the election of a president. While this case is in some respects more complicated in consequence of peculiarities in the form and process of elec-

tion, (the votes by which the choice is finally made being the votes of states as represented in their electoral colleges, and the votes of individual citizens being given not for the president directly but for the presidential electors,) it may on that very account be so much the better for the purpose of illustration.

You are inquiring then, in reference to the election of a president, how your vote may be given so as to tell most effectually for the true welfare of the country. We give for your guidance these suggestions; and it is for you to say whether they do not commend themselves to your common sense and to your conscience.

1. Is there any great question concerning the public welfare, which this election will decide? Does the question of a war with Britain or with Mexico, or the question of the extension of the area of slavery, or the question of abolishing the infamous slave-trade in the District of Columbia, or the question of sweeping away all the old corruptions of the Post-Office Department,—hang trembling in the scales of this election? Is one of the two leading candidates pledged one way, and his party with him; while the other candidate and his party are pledged the other way? And is it a matter of doubt which of these two candidates will be successful? Is it obvious that the defeat of one particular candidate, whose prospects of success are such as stimulate his friends to every effort, is the only human possibility of preventing that great national mischief and wickedness to which he is committed?

2. Supposing this to be the case, you come next to the question, whether your ballot and your personal influence in your legitimate sphere can make any difference in the result. Is the result doubtful so far as your own state is concerned? —for you know, it is there only that your ballot can be counted. Are

the opinions of your fellow-citizens in your own state so divided that it can not be known, till the votes are counted, which side is to preponderate? Is there a possibility, on the one hand, that the six votes, or the twelve, or the thirty-six, which the electoral college of your state is to give in the final election, will be given for the candidate and the party that are pledged to put the country upon some new career of crime, or pledged against some great and salutary reformation? And is there also a possibility, on the other hand, that your ballot and the ballots of those with whom you have some influence and who will be likely to go with you, will be just what is wanted to turn the scales the other way, and to make out a plurality for a different ticket? Suppose that, in such a case, you and your friends, instead of uniting to defeat the candidate that has pledged himself to a policy of wickedness and mischief, permit yourselves to be controlled by party discipline; and accordingly, bewildered with the idea that the cohesion of your party is the first thing to be regarded, you give your ballots for him; and your ballots determine the vote of your state, and the vote of your state determines the election. Or suppose that instead of casting your ballots in such a way that they shall be of some avail in the counting, you throw them away upon some third ticket, with precisely the same result. There is one of these United States, whose electoral votes, four years ago, turned the scale for the immediate annexation of Texas and for all the crimes and mischiefs which that measure could not but draw after it. The electoral college which gave those fatal votes was chosen not by a majority, but only by a plurality. Of that plurality there were thousands who gave their ballots, protesting against the impolicy and the iniquity of the measure to which their candidate was pledged, and which was

in fact the one great issue. Had they then broken their shackles as they have since done—had they then voted manfully against the nomination of their party, all the results would have been reversed. There would have been no immediate annexation—no Mexican war—no squandering of a hundred and fifty millions of our treasure—no slaughtering of twenty thousand of our citizens—no extension of the area of slavery—and no “old Rough and Ready” to be burraed into the presidency. Nay, had those other thousands in that same state, who, instead of meeting the question really at issue, yielded themselves up to be governed by a narrow formula—had those men who threw their votes away upon a ticket for which they knew there was no chance of success—voted for that other leading candidate whose pledges were for peace and against the madness of immediate annexation, they would have saved their country.

3. The two preceding questions are often to be answered in the negative. If it so happens that there is no great issue of peace or war, of freedom or slavery, of justice or iniquity, involved in the choice between two leading candidates;—or if it so happens that there is no doubt which way your state will go, and no chance that your vote will have any effect on the issue;—then the question of your duty may be determined by other considerations, which under the former hypothesis were in abeyance. Your vote in such a case may be regarded not as a power that is to affect the result, but as a testimony that is to bear upon the formation and utterance of public opinion. In such a case, questions like these demand a serious consideration. Can I give my vote, either alone or by agreement with others, in such a way as to testify against slavery? Is there any way in which my vote may be made effective as a testimony against the pas-

sion for war and the mad admiration of military glory? Is there any way in which my vote will tend to the disorganization and dispersion of those great factions which have turned politics into a meaner game than that of the cock-pit, and all the offices and honors of the Union and of the states into one great fund of corruption? Is there any way in which my vote can tell against the demoralizing practice of conferring honors and emoluments upon unworthy men? In the case now supposed, such considerations as these are the great considerations by which your action may reasonably and safely be determined.

If other questions arise, of which we have taken no notice, let it be remembered that we have not attempted a complete analysis and discussion of the subject, but only to offer such thoughts of our own as may stimulate inquiry in other minds, and may lead in the end to a full and exact investigation in some other quarter. Far less do we attempt to give the mechanical rules of duty that shall supersede the necessity of thought; we would rather waken our readers to the conviction that in such a matter as this they can not perform their duty at all without thinking and inquiring earnestly for themselves. Duty and thought are intimately connected with each other. A creature made for duty is a creature made for thought. The science of doing right in all the complicated relations in which men live and act, can never be reduced to a few self-applying formulæ by which the necessity of deliberation, inquiry and analysis shall be done away. The practical and prudential understanding, perceiving fitnesses and tendencies, and the relation of means to ends, can not be safely trusted unless it is invigorated by a living and healthy moral sense; and on the other hand, the moral sense, if it does not constantly summon to

its aid and hold under its control all the thinking powers,—if it indolently and slavishly yields itself to the dominion of one narrow formula and another,—becomes perverted, dull,

diseased, and loses its vital sympathy with Him, the Infinite Wisdom, who “is light and with whom is no darkness at all.”

### LITERARY NOTICES.

*The Genius of Scotland; or Sketches of Scottish Scenery, Literature and Religion.* By ROBERT TURNBULL. Third edition. New York and Pittsburg. Robert Carter. 1847.

THE emigrant leaves his early home, and yet in a most important sense brings it with him. The scenery on which his eyes first opened, and with which his senses in childhood were familiar, never fades from his recollections. It haunts his memory through all his life. The manners, domestic and social, with which his earlier years were encompassed as with the atmosphere, seem the only natural and rational manners. The early recollections of the great men of his country; the great in arms, in literature and religion, are invested with an interest which he can not transfer to the heroes of his adopted land.

It is not surprising that he should desire to communicate to others these recollections which are to him so dear, and the feelings which these recollections inspire. If he have an ardent temper, he longs to excite the sympathies of others, in the things which interest him so intensely, and can not avoid the effort to introduce them to his new friends, and to explain his love for his early home. If he can write, it is not at all surprising that he should seek by a book to lead his adopted countrymen to understand the secret of his attachment to the land of his Fathers.

We honor this impulse. It is generous and elevating. We value

its results. We believe it will make American literature more liberal and catholic than that of England. It will also enrich it with a variety and copiousness which the literature of no other country has seen. The Scotchman, the German, and the Slavonian, may be expected to acquaint us with their world of thought and feeling, and to make familiar to us their peculiar national spirit.

The work before us was written by a native of Scotland, who has been favorably known as a writer, for his pleasant style and generous enthusiasm. A year or two since, after his return from a visit to his native land—in which his youthful remembrances had been revived, and his youthful enthusiasm had been re-inspired—he was prompted to write the volume before us—the object of which should be “in an easy, natural way, to give his readers an adequate conception of the Scenery, Literature and Religion of Scotland.” The uniqueness of the design is only surpassed by the felicity of its execution. There are woven together the incidents of personal adventure—conversations with Scottish peasants—descriptions of scenery—with sketches of Knox, Burns, Wilson, and Chalmers, and others. This various matter might seem to involve confusion and disorder; but the writer has managed to express himself in a style so natural and flowing, and to pass from one to another of his various themes, by transitions so easy and graceful, as to produce an instructive and de-

lightful volume. We only do justice to our view of it, when we say, that in every good sense with none that is bad, it is a truly "readable" book. It would seem that some skill, and perhaps not a little sacrifice of principle, would be required to write sketches of men so different as Knox, Wilson, Walter Scott, Burns, Chalmers and Duncan, in such a way as to make the one compatible with the other—or so as to satisfy the admirers of the one without displeasing those of another. We can not see that Mr. Turnbull has failed in principle. We are quite sure he has not failed to put the most generous construction upon the faults of the men whom he criticises. He has also explained the secret of their popularity with his countrymen, and in so doing has done much to enable the American to read them with the eye and heart of a Scotchman. The genial yet unobtrusive religious feeling that runs through this volume, is honorable to the writer as a clergyman. It would have been dishonorable to him not to exhibit it; and yet the piety is natural rather than professional, which is a rare merit, and one that deserves our praise. Such contributions as this volume to what is called our "lighter literature," have a greater value than at the first view they seem to possess; and every successful effort of the kind merits a generous recompense.

*Religion Teaching by Example.*—  
By RICHARD W. DICKINSON, D.D.  
New York : Robert Carter, 1848.  
pp. 456.

THE title of this book does not at once suggest the precise nature of its subject. One expects to find in it an exhibition of the power of Christian example; whereas its object is, to present some of the prominent truths and precepts of religion, in the light of sacred history. It is rather, religion *taught* or inculcated by examples; though the author may justify his title, from the defini-

tion of profane history as "Philosophy Teaching by Example."

Several of the leading incidents in sacred history, are here considered in their relations to the fundamental principles of morality, and to both the moral and the providential government of God. These incidents, in themselves so fitted to arrest attention, are thus brought before the mind in an attractive and instructive manner, and are applied to the use for which they were chiefly recorded. The style of the author is lucid, and sometimes elegant; occasionally too rhetorical for the general character of the work. He commonly avoids vexed questions in theology; though in considering the "origin and issues of sin," in the first chapter, he seems to be needlessly confused for want of just views of free agency. Regarding the fallen angels as having been "created holy," he can not conceive "how pride, or any other sinful emotion, could find an entrance to their hearts." But he wisely, though ungrammatically disposes of the subject by saying, "no matter in what way the angels fell—here is the fact; and it is *equally* unphilosophical, as well as undevout, to reject it because we are not able to explain synthetically all the phenomena in which it is concerned." We admire the candor and amiability of the writer, and commend his book to those who would see the religion of the Bible developed in its various relations to human nature.

*Fundamental Philosophy, or Elements of Primitive Philosophy; being the first Division of a Complete System of Philosophical Science.* From the German of WILLIAM TRAUGOTT KRUG, Prof. of Philos. in the Univ. of Leipsic. Hudson, Ohio. W. Skinner & Co. 1848. pp. 59. 18mo.

THIS is a faithful translation of the 132 propositions in Krug's Fundamental Philosophy, omitting alto-

gether the explanations, illustrations and proofs, which constitute the greater part of the original work. The German work was first published in 1803, 8vo. It passed to a second edition in 1819, and to a third, with many improvements and enlargements, in 1827. The author pronounces it his *hauptwerk*, "chief work; which, he says, must not be read cursorily, but must be studied thoroughly, if one would fully understand the author's system of philosophy." We entirely agree with him in this last remark; for, not having the original with all its explanations before us, we read over this little book three times, and were not then able fully to understand it without recurrence to the same author's great Dictionary of Philosophy on the main propositions. We therefore regret that the accomplished translator did not present the entire work to his American readers, who can not be supposed very familiar with the Kantean phraseology pervading this book.

Prof. William Traugott Krug was educated in the Kantean school, became a Professor of Philosophy at Wittemberg in 1794; at Frankfort on the Oder in 1801; at Königsberg, in the chair of Kant, in 1805; removed to Leipsic in 1809, relinquished his professorship in 1813, served one year in the army as a volunteer, and then resumed his professorship at Leipsic, where he continued till his death in 1842, at the age of 72. He wrote much, on philosophy, ethics, law, politics, &c., and was a pleasing writer, learned, lucid, and accommodating himself to men of ordinary minds. His great Dictionary of Philosophy, though too subservient to the propagation of his particular views, is a very useful work.

For several years in the early part of life, Krug adhered strictly to the philosophical principles of Kant. But when Fichte, Schelling and others, began to overleap the bounds prescribed by Kant to all

true philosophy, Krug caught something of their spirit. Yet he did not altogether abandon the Kantean doctrines, but he attempted, like Bouterwek, Fries, Calker, and some others, to perfect the system of Kant, by modifying its basis, and laying a broader foundation for scientific knowledge. Instead of admitting, with Kant, that we passively receive the crude *matter* of all our knowledge of material things through the *senses*, and that we know nothing of the essential nature of their objects, but only their phenomena, or the impressions they make on us; and that of supersensible things, spiritual beings, animal and vegetable life, &c., we know nothing but their attributes or powers; Krug supposed we can obtain true objective knowledge both of sensible and supersensible things. He makes *consciousness* the primary source of all true knowledge. For, consciousness, as he maintains, is the *Synthesis of Being and Knowledge*. In other words, if we can understand him, in all our acts of consciousness, some object is present to the mind, and we behold it and have a knowledge of it. This knowledge may indeed be at first obscure and unsatisfactory; but by repeated acts of consciousness, and a careful inspection of those acts, the knowledge becomes clear, distinct and perfect.—This Synthesis of Being and Knowledge, he pronounces to be a *Transcendental Synthesis*; or a synthesis the cause or ground of which is wholly beyond our investigation. It is an ultimate fact, and we can not go beyond it.

This theory Krug first published in his *New Organon of Philosophy*, in the year 1801. He afterwards more fully developed and defended it in his *Fundamental Philosophy*, the epitome of which is contained in the little volume before us. During forty years the author labored untiringly to propagate this modification of the Kantean philosophy. But, if we are not misinformed, this

system never obtained extensive currency among the Germans, being held by only one of the numerous sects of the great Kantean school. A modern Greek, the pupil of Krug, translated the Fundamental Philosophy into the language of the modern Greeks; another translated it into Hungarian, and a third into Polish; but with what effects on those nations, we are not informed.

*Posthumous Influence: A Sermon occasioned by the death of the Hon. Samuel Hubbard, LL.D., Associate Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, preached to the Park Street Congregation, Boston, Sabbath morning, January 2, 1848. By SILAS AIKEN, Pastor of the Church.*

*A Good Man Lamented: A Sermon preached in the First Congregational Church, Canandaigua, N. Y., at the funeral of Walter Hubbard, Tuesday, March 28, 1848. By the Pastor of the Church, O. E. DAGGETT: with Notes appended.*

THE excellent men whose memories are commemorated in these discourses were lawyers; the first distinguished in his profession, and both distinguished for their usefulness, and held in the highest esteem as men of business, as citizens, and as members of the church of Christ. They have rested from their labors; but the salutary influence of their example, prayers, and charities, will long survive them. The lives of such men are a sufficient refutation of the prevalent opinion that young men of Christian character, if they would be useful in the highest degree, must devote themselves to the Gospel ministry. The demand for preachers may be so pressing that no young man of education, talents and piety, should prefer another work; but ordinarily other doors of usefulness may be open to him, so full of promise, that he may conscientiously enter them.

The legal and the medical professions no less than the clerical, may be adorned by the highest style of Christian character; and in them no less than in the latter, a most beneficent influence may be exerted. The want of piety in a minister of the Gospel shocks our moral sense, but it is no less really a defect in the other professions. We need men of devoted piety at the bar to plead the cause of justice; and at the bed side of the sick, to minister both to the body and the mind of the sufferer. It should not therefore be pronounced a dereliction of duty, if a young man, considering his peculiar talents, tastes and opportunities, devotes himself to the study and practice of law. It may be the field which he is best fitted to occupy; and if he should be successful, one in which he can contribute most efficiently to the triumph of truth in the world. The conflict of the courts, and the drudgery of business, may be so uncongenial to his taste, that he can not be happy in the profession; but that he can be an upright lawyer, and a consistent Christian, we have no doubt. A profession which has to do with the right administration of justice, may be practiced with integrity, and confer important benefits upon mankind.

The erroneous views commonly taken of this subject, we ascribe to the notion, that the great work of teaching religion, and guiding men to heaven, devolves exclusively on ministers consecrated to the work. As we return more and more to the primitive idea of the church in which it was expected that every brother would share in the work of mutual edification, and in instructing the ignorant, we shall do more to introduce men of Christian principle not only into the Gospel ministry, but into the other learned professions. Every Christian will then be considered a laborer in the vineyard of Christ, and every professional man as enjoying peculiar facilities for doing good.

THE  
NEW ENGLANDER.  
No. XXIV.

OCTOBER, 1848.

IRELAND.

In our number for April, we endeavored to spread before our readers, the actual condition of Ireland, together with some of the causes of her present social degradation. In reviewing the article, we feel, that notwithstanding the painful array of facts which it presents, we have failed to convey any adequate idea of the miseries of that unhappy land; and yet the very description which to us appears so meagre, has probably been read with incredulity by those who have never before looked upon the fearful picture of a nation in want. For the sake of suffering humanity, we could wish that all we have written were a fiction; but as in the first instance we made no statement touching the destitution of the people, except upon the authority of competent and impartial eyewitnesses, we now find every such statement corroborated by facts daily brought to our knowledge.\*

We asked a bright Irish lad of fifteen, the other day,

"What did you use to live upon in Ireland?"

"Potatoes, sir."

"Did you never have any meat before you came to America?"

"Never a bit of mate, sir."

"Did you have no bread either?"

"Sometimes, when we couldnt buy the potatoes we would have a little bread."

This was in the summer months, when the old crop of potatoes was exhausted, and the new could not yet be gathered; and when of course potatoes, from being cheap and plenty, rose to a higher price per stone than meal, which was commonly beyond the reach of the poorer classes. The "meal months" are always a season of great privation. Then only in all the year did our little Irish lad taste bread, and then not because bread could be afforded, but because potatoes could not. We could believe him when he said, "I'd rather live in this country, sir, than in that;" for though his home consisted only of two rooms, neither of them ten feet square, dark, solitary and poorly furnished, without even a comfortable bed for a family of four, yet he

\* Of the thousand and one publications which the state of Ireland has called forth from the British press, only a few have reached us; for most of them were of such an ephemeral character as to have vanished from the market before our blank order could be filled. Those which have been received, however, possess a standard value, and others are constantly arriving.

was decently clothed and well fed, or as he expressed it, 'the diet is better in this country than in that.' This lad belonged to a Protestant family, which had lived in comparatively good circumstances previous to 'the distress'; but whose condition after all, was substantially that described on pp. 279-80 of our April number.\*

The rules of the Romish church respecting fasts, are quite superfluous, so far as the peasantry of Ireland are concerned, since for them "to abstain from meats" can be no privation. Those rules have force chiefly with the priesthood, and with the religious orders. Mrs. Nicholson informs us, that at Father Mathew's table during Lent, "three kinds of fish, with puddings, jellies and fruits, were substituted for pig, beef and poultry;"—and that a more jovial priest, whom she encountered at the same season, was by no means choice of his imprecations against the "blackguard salt herring," to which he had been restricted until he was "scalt intirely;" but the common people would welcome the return of the forty days fast, if it would bring with it so much as a herring to vary their monotonous fare of potatoes and salt.

This allusion to the dietetic discipline of the Roman Catholic church, leads us to consider the whole influence of that church upon the moral character and the social condition of the Irish people. In no country of Europe, not in Spain itself, certainly not in Italy, not even in the petty regency of Tréves, where the wonder of "the Holy Coat" was for weeks exhibited to adoring thousands, have the priest-

hood had more absolute sway over the mass of society than in Ireland. By the ignorant, the priest is looked upon as one invested with a divine sanctity; and even those who have learned to discriminate between the office and the man, have a feeling of reverence for the former that borders on superstition.

"What honor you pay to these men," said Mrs. Nicholson to an Irishman of Cork, who was bowing reverently to a priest.

"Not to the man," said he, "but to what he may have about him. He may have been to visit some dying person, and have some of the broken body of the Savior with him!"

No class of Catholic emigrants in the United States, remains so long under the surveillance of the priesthood as the Irish. The Germans soon become enfranchised; even the German priests are liberal and independent in comparison with their Irish brethren; and nationality often proves to be with each a stronger tie than their common faith.

The Roman Catholic religion, though not indigenous to Ireland, has found a congenial soil and atmosphere in the civil institutions and the social condition of the people. More than eighty per cent., or between six and seven millions of the population are Catholics; and this class of population increases in a larger ratio than any other. The following curious fact is stated on the authority of Mr. Shafio Adair. "A lease sell out, some years since, of a town-lund in Antrim, which had been grunted a century ago for a term of years and three lives. The youngest life, then a baby in the cradle, lingered above ninety years. The consideration of the lease was expressed to be, the establishment of a Protestant tenantry; and a trifling rent was charged in consideration of the nature of the expected service. After the usual fashion, and to meet the griping

\* His father, a gardener, had a lease of two and a half acres, in Connaught, with a stone cottage and a small barn. Rent £3.12s. per annum. Taxes £3.10s. Wages 5s. a week in pleasant weather, say about £10 per annum. What wonder that he left because he could not pay the rent.

spirit of the lessee's representatives, subdivision proceeded at a fearful rate. When this lease expired, there were eighteen hundred souls upon the town-land, and *not a Protestant amongst them.*"

There are in Ireland four Catholic archbishops, one for each of the provinces,—Ulster, Leinster, Munster, and Connaught; their sees are Armagh, Dublin, Cashel and Tuam. A similar arrangement formerly existed in the established church; but of late the archbishoprics of Cashel and Tuam have been reduced to bishoprics. In addition to the four archbishops, there are twenty-four bishops and two thousand six hundred and fifty-five clergy of the Romish church: the whole body of whom are supported directly by the people; the priests receiving, on an average, £100 per annum, though many of them have a much larger income, and employ several curates and other assistants. The number of parish priests is nine hundred and eighty three, of curates, one thousand three hundred and sixty-two, of regular clergy of the religious orders, three hundred.\* As the ancient estates and revenues of the Catholic church in Ireland, were long since transferred to other hands, the only present sources of revenue, are the fees for the celebration of births, marriages and masses, Christmas and Easter dues, and other voluntary offerings. Of course it is for the interest of the clergy, to promote the increase of population, by encouraging early marriages, and to keep the people in a state of dependence on their favor for spiritual blessings. In this way the Romish system, always costly and severe in its exactions, has contributed to the social degradation of Ireland. It has there led

to the same general results, which are witnessed under its undisputed influence in other countries; and that too, notwithstanding it has been brought into contrast and competition with one of the worst specimens of Protestantism that has been produced since the Reformation. The Roman Catholic church in Ireland has done little to elevate the people; she has not been as the church of Christ ever should be, a vitalizing and reforming power in society; on the contrary, while in the favorable position of a champion for the people against political and social proscription, she has yet done much in various ways to keep them in that state of depression to which centuries of mal-government have reduced them. We charge it upon the Roman Catholic church in Ireland, as a high crime, that while possessing almost unbounded influence and authority over the people, while having the moral training of the nation in her hands, she has not elevated them in intelligence and in virtue, in spite of bad legislation and of a vicious social economy. Amid all the anarchy, the corruption, the oppression, with which Ireland has been cursed, there was one source from which a redeeming influence should have gone forth; a church strong in the confidence and in the affections of the people, should have diffused among them the leaven of knowledge, of peace, of order, of industry, and of a pure morality; should have developed their intellectual and moral strength: should have educated them for freedom; should have led them out from barbarism into the front ranks of civilization. But the Roman Catholic church in Ireland, with a pliant nation to be molded at her will, so far from fulfilling the high mission of their social regeneration, has riveted upon them also the chains of spiritual despotism, and made them more absolutely the victims of superstition and of priestly domination.

\* *Battersby's Complete Catholic Directory*, Dublin, 1848. The number of the religious orders is probably greatly underrated, as also the income of the priests.

than any other people in Christendom.

Puritanism, under oppression, worked out far different results, not only for its immediate adherents, but for the English nation and for all mankind. Proscription, acts of uniformity, fines, imprisonment, the star-chamber, the pillory and the scaffold, all these served only to develop more powerfully the principles and the energies of the despised sect: and to make them at length the very fountain-head of all that is great and good in English history. Why has not Romanism done the same for Ireland?

But though we charge it as a crime upon the Roman Catholic church in Ireland, that while she has had it in her power to do so much for the renovation of society, she has, in fact, done so little; and though we feel that in some respects she has aggravated evils which she should have removed, we are happy also to express the conviction, that in other respects her influence has been salutary upon a people whom she has attended almost without intermission in their slow march from barbarism toward civilization. Indeed it would be dishonorable to whatever of Christian truth she yet retains, to suppose it otherwise. She has done not a little of late years, for the education of her youth, for the relief of the poor, the aged, the infirm and the orphaned, and for the removal of particular social and moral evils. In what other country, and under what other system, could a single individual have procured five or six millions of signatures to the temperance pledge? The labors of Father Mathew, though not strictly ecclesiastical, were immeasurably promoted by the sanctity which pertains to him as a Capuchin, to his blessing, and to the medal which he had consecrated.\* His

success affords a striking illustration of the manner in which even superstition may be made auxiliary to a wholesome moral reform, and also of the stupendous enginery of the Roman Catholic hierarchy for good or for evil. The temperance movement in Ireland did not originate with Father Mathew; it had already enlisted the sympathies of even the Catholic population, when he entered into it, against the wishes, or with only the reluctant approval of many of the clergy; but the result illustrates the power of the religious element among the people.

The Catholic clergy of Ireland, have been accused of instigating rebellion, and even of denouncing individuals from the altar, as worthy of the knife or the bullet of the assassin. In some instances, undoubtedly, this has been done. But the influence of the clergy as a body, has been upon the side of peace and order; they have done much to further the conciliatory policy of O'Connell. The Catholic Prelates, at their annual meeting at Dublin, Oct., 1847, presented an address to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, in which they allude to the rights of property in these terms: "The legitimate rights of property so necessary for the maintenance of society, we have ever felt it our duty to recognize and inculcate. The guilty outbreaks of violence and revenge which sometimes unfortunately disgrace the country, we deplore and reprobate; but, in justice to their general character and habits, we feel it our duty to declare our conviction, that there is not on earth a people who exhibit more respect for law and order under unheard of privations, than the people of Ireland;" and they furthermore express their anxiety, "to preserve the souls of

\* A story is told of a man who felt his appetite for drink returning after he had

taken the pledge, and who walked several miles to Father Mathew to procure a dispensation from his vow; but when told that the blessing must be revoked, he was frightened into perpetual sobriety.

their flocks from crime, and society from the danger of disorganization."

The Pope has recommended to the Irish clergy, to refrain from any interference with political questions, except when the lives or the religion of the people are in danger ; exceptions which will be approved by every true New Englander.

On the whole then we look upon the Roman Catholic religion as a curse to Ireland, because by keeping the people in spiritual bondage, and by imposing upon them heavy pecuniary burdens, it has disqualifed them for any other state than that of vassalage and degradation in which they have been held since the conquest ; and because with a power over even the temporal hopes and fears of men which few systems of religion possess, it has failed to elevate the people or even to prepare them for a higher social condition. The nation would breathe freer if this incubus were shaken off. And yet we say with all candor, that we do not regard this as the chief evil of Ireland, nor sum up our prescription for her woes, with the denunciation of the Roman Catholic church.

But a greater curse to Ireland, is the union of church and state. The established religion is the religion of a very small minority of the people. Recent inquiries on the part of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, show that deducting the Wesleyan Methodists, the Episcopalians in Ireland amount only to 752,000 persons. Their number is said to be decreasing not only relatively but actually ; for according to the parliamentary returns (from the commissioners of public instruction) in 1834-5, there were of the established church in Ireland, 852,064, Catholics, 6,427,712, Presbyterians, 642,356, and other Protestant dissenters 21,808 : i. e. out of every hundred souls, 11 are of the establishment, 81 Roman Catholics, and 8 Protestant dissent-

ers. In some counties, the proportion of Protestants to Catholics is exceedingly small ; while in no instance do the Protestants constitute a majority of the population. In Antrim, there are 59,730 Protestants to 89,754 Catholics ; in Armagh, 70,634 Protestants to 112,395 Catholics, in Dublin city 61,883 Protestants to 172,075 Catholics ; and in Fermanagh 61,624 Protestants to 94,837 Catholics. These give the largest ratio of Protestants. But in Cork, there are only 55,187 Protestants to 751,682 Catholics ; in Clare 4,971 Protestants to 251,066 Catholics ; in Galway, 4,802 Protestants to 253,155 Catholics, and in Mayo, 11,493 Protestants to 360,977 Catholics. This is the proportion of Protestants to Catholics ; that of the members of the establishment is still less.

But the Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland, has a revenue of nearly one million sterling, or about £1 for every member ; and in addition to this, it has received at various times donations from the state amounting to 1,749,818L. And it must be remembered that this is not only the church of the minority, but of the rich minority, who are abundantly able to furnish themselves with religious instruction ; for nine-tenths of the property of Ireland has been estimated to belong to Protestants. Pluralities, non-residence and sinecurism have hitherto existed to a greater extent in Ireland, than in England ; but these evils have of late been diminished. At the last census, from 151 parishes no Protestants whatever were returned ; from 194 parishes less than 10 each ; from 198 less than 20 ; from 133 less than 30 ; from 107 less than 40 ; from 77 less than 50 ; so that there are 860 parishes containing less than 50 Protestants each, yet having an aggregate income of 58,000L.

To maintain a religious establishment at this enormous rate, the whole country is taxed to the extent

virtually of one-tenth of its available resources. No tithes are now levied in Ireland, for in consequence of the difficulty of collecting them, "a fixed payment of three-fourths their amount, to be made by the landlords or others having a perpetual interest in the land," has recently been substituted in their stead. But after all, the burden still falls in the end upon the immediate occupiers of the soil, the poor cottiers, the great bulk of whom are Catholics.

Not only was the tithe-system one of gross injustice, but great oppression and cruelty were often practiced in enforcing it. Seldom of late years were tithes collected in Ireland, without scenes of violence and bloodshed. Often was the last article of furniture in the cabin, the last heap of potatoes in the pit, or the solitary pig on which the tenant relied for the payment of his rent and the support of his family, seized by the tithe collector in the name of a Protestant clergyman, having the care of from ten to fifty souls. To render this injustice the more flagrant, about the middle of the last century an act was passed by the Irish Parliament, exempting grass lands from tithe; so that while the tenth part of every little potato patch was exacted from the starving tenants, the vast tracts upon which the herds of the nobility were fed were left unmolested.

We have not space even to recount the acts of oppression which have been multiplied against the Catholics of Ireland. The following brief summary of them from the pen of the late Sidney Smith,\* will show us that a Catholic Irishman has good reason for his cordial hatred of Protestantism.

Not twenty days elapsed from the signing of the treaty of Limerick, (Oct. 3, 1691,) guaranteeing to the Catholics the restoration of estates, privileges and immunities, as they

had enjoyed them in the time of Charles II., and entire security from any disturbance or molestation on account of their religion,—not twenty days had elapsed after the signing of these articles by the English general in behalf of his sovereign, when "the English Parliament excluded Catholics from the Irish Houses of Lords and Commons, by compelling them to take the oaths of supremacy before admission.

"In 1695, the Catholics were deprived of all means of educating their children, at home or abroad, and of the privilege of being guardians to their own or to other persons' children. Then all the Catholics were disarmed—and then all the priests banished.

"On the 4th of March, 1704, it was enacted, that any son of a Catholic who would turn Protestant, should succeed to the family estate, which from that moment could no longer be sold, or charged with debt and legacy. On the same day, Popish fathers were debarred, by a penalty of 500*l.* from being guardians to their own children. If the child, however young, declared himself a Protestant, he was to be delivered immediately to some Protestant relation. No Protestant to marry a Papist. No Papist to purchase land, or take a lease of land for more than thirty-one years. If the profits of the lands so leased by the Catholics amounted to above a certain rate settled by the act—farm to belong to the first Protestant who made the discovery. No Papist to be in a line of entail; but the estate to pass on to the next Protestant heir, as if the Papist were dead. If a Papist dies intestate, and no Protestant heir can be found, property to be equally divided among all the sons, or, if he has none, among all the daughters. By the 16th clause of this bill, no Papist to hold any office, civil or military. Not to dwell in Limerick or Galway, except on certain conditions. Not to

\* Works, Art. "Catholics;" (Edinburgh Review, 1808.)

vote at elections. Not to hold ad-  
vowsons.

"In 1709, Papists were prevented from holding an annuity for life. . . . Papists keeping schools to be prosecuted as convicts. Popish priests who are converted, to receive 30*l.* *per annum.* . . . Nobody to hold property in trust for a Catholic. Juries, in all trials growing out of these statutes to be Protestants. Catholics not to serve on grand juries. In any trial upon statutes for strengthening the Protestant interest, a Papist juror may be peremptorily challenged. No Papist to take more than two apprentices, except in the linen trade. Rewards are given by the same act for the discovery of the Popish clergy; 50*l.* for discovering a Popish bishop; 20*l.* for a common Popish clergyman; 10*l.* for a Popish usher!

"In the next reign, Papists were prohibited from being either high or petty constables, and from voting at elections.

"In the reign of George II. it was decreed that no Papist should marry a Protestant; any priest celebrating such a marriage *to be hanged.*"

This cruel legislation is at an end. A more wise and liberal policy toward the Catholics, began to prevail in the reign of George III; yet it was not till within twenty years past, "that the Roman Catholics were fully emancipated from all civil disabilities on account of religion, and were placed as respects their political rights and franchises, nearly on the same footing as Protestants."

But justice will not be done to the Catholics of Ireland, until the connection of the church and the state is wholly abolished, or until the Catholic clergy are admitted to an equitable participation in the revenues of which they were originally deprived by ejection, and to which, on the only plausible principle of a state-church—that it shall be the church of the majority—they have a rightful claim. Did we not believe that the final dissolution of the

union of church and state is at hand, and that the days of the establishment in England itself are numbered, we should contend for the establishment of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, as a measure of simple justice. But the immediate abolition of the present establishment in Ireland, is demanded by every principle of equity, and by every consideration of policy. We say immediate, but not unconditional. To sever the union of church and state, leaving the church in possession of the revenues which have accumulated under that union, would be hardly less unjust to the body of the people, and hardly less prejudicial to the interests of spiritual religion, than to perpetuate the union itself. On the other hand, to eject from their livings the present incumbents in the established church, would be a breach of good faith, and therefore an act of gross injustice. But if as livings in turn become vacant, they should revert to the state, and their revenues should be appropriated to the support of common schools, the liquidation of the national debt, or to some other object of public benefit, while the people of each parish should be left to the voluntary support of their religious institutions, the present system would soon die out without detriment to the rights or the interests of any party, and the removal of a monster evil would be effected almost without a shock. We use the term immediate, to denote, that the dissolution of the union of church and state should be at once determined upon, to be effected as soon as in the nature of things, it can be wisely and safely done.

What a continual cause of irritation, to say nothing of the injustice of it, must be the exaction of "church cess," and of "minister's money" from the dissenters; and the levying of a parochial rate from a community, nine-tenths of whom are Roman Catholics, to wash the sur-

pliance of a minister of the establishment, and to furnish some twenty wealthy churchmen with bread and wine for their communion. What an outrageous imposition, is the tax on each house in a city like Cork, where the Catholics are to the Protestants as twelve to one, in lieu of tithes, for the support of the Protestant Episcopal incumbents of the city parishes.

Unfortunately the Presbyterians in Ireland, are also in the receipt of government bounty ; the *regium donum*, originally bestowed by William III. as an expression of gratitude for service rendered, having been confirmed by an annual grant of Parliament. This stipend amounts on an average, to 75*l.* for every Presbyterian pastor in Ireland, whether Unitarian or Orthodox.\* It remains to be seen, whether, if the project of endowing the Catholic clergy should receive the sanction of the ministry and of Parliament, the Presbyterians, notwithstanding their hereditary animosity toward the Catholics, will be content to share with them the patronage of government, or will renounce that patronage for themselves, and unite with their independent brethren upon the voluntary principle.

It is only upon that principle that the thorough evangelization of Ireland can be accomplished. The curse of an ecclesiastical establishment, as it exists in that country, must be removed, before the full power of the Gospel as a remedial system can be exerted there. For the honor of Protestantism, for the name of Christianity itself, we trust that the day is not distant, when the ecclesiastical system of Ireland shall cease to be among her most grievous oppressions ; and when a church, which is dignified with the name and

the spirit of Whately, shall be no longer a reproach for its intolerance.

We have now completed our survey of the social, the political, the economical, and the religious condition of Ireland. Our readers have doubtless kept pace with events in that country since our last article ;—the renewed horrors of famine in the south and west ; the increased turbulence of the people ; the active measures of the government to keep down insurrection ; the violence of the repeal agitation—no longer a merely moral movement,—and the threatened appeal to arms ; the arrest of popular leaders for sedition ; the pompous state trials resulting in the transportation of patriots who were panting for martyrdom ; and in short all the indications of an approaching civil war. The events of the past few months, have increased both the urgency and the embarrassment of the question, What shall be done for Ireland ?

To that question we now direct our thoughts. It will be more easy to reply to it, by showing what ought not to be done in Ireland,—what measures will not suffice for her relief—than by prescribing any definite and feasible plan of social and political reform.

One of the most prominent measures proposed for the relief of Ireland, is the application of the English poor-laws to that country. This measure has provoked much acrimonious discussion, both in Parliament and through the press, and has met in general with the uncompromising hostility of the Irish landlords. In February, 1847, an act was passed, (10 Vic. cap. vii.) “for the temporary relief of destitute persons in Ireland,” the fundamental principle of which was, the granting of out-door relief to the able-bodied

\* There are a few Presbyterian Covenanters and Seceders in Ulster, who magnanimously refuse the “*regium donum*,” and who contend manfully for the voluntary principle.

† The term ‘out-door relief,’ is applied to relief administered to the poor at their own homes, or at some public depot, in distinction from the relief afforded in the work-house.

poor, "when destitute and unable to support themselves by their own industry, or by other lawful means." This act recognizes the right of the able-bodied poor, when destitute of employment, to support from the government: and the question is, whether that right shall be conceded, in future legislation for Ireland.

A grave question this, truly; not only for the British ministry, but for governments every where;—whether the support of the poor, is one of the functions of government. That it belongs to society to provide for the support of the poor, none can dispute; but whether it belongs to government to make such provision, is a question for the tax-payers of New York and Boston to consider, with their alms-houses crowded with the paupers of Europe. The operation of this principle in Ireland can easily be foreseen. According to the Earl of Shrewsbury,—whose sensible, straight-forward discussion of Irish affairs, is in striking contrast with his puerile conceits about "the virgins of the Tyrol"—there are at least 4,000,000 persons, or "a little more than fifty per cent. of the whole population of Ireland, living, or rather struggling through a miserable existence, upon the result of a precarious employment, (averaging about twenty-two weeks of the whole year, as given in evidence by the poor-law commissioners,) and the accident of a potato crop, or the alms of those but one degree less afflicted than themselves." Add to these the destitute of the civic population, and of the more favored agricultural districts, and "the list of possible claimants upon the poor-law is swelled to the enormous amount of some six millions of human beings, or seventy per cent. of the entire population requiring food and maintenance during thirty or thirty-one weeks of the year."

The burden of this enormous pauper population, by the provisions of the act, is to fall upon the land-

holders—the owners of estates, and the farming tenants: and if funds are advanced by the general government to meet an exigency, they are to be charged as a loan to the district thus relieved. Now what will be the operation of this system? We have already remarked, that estates in Ireland are very generally mortgaged for from one half to two-thirds their value, or are encumbered with life-interests and other liabilities. In fact, it is said by those who are most competent to form an opinion on the subject, that the great majority of landlords are bankrupt, in the sense of being unable to pay their debts from the net income of their estates. That income has been greatly diminished for two or three years past by arrears of rent, and by the increase of poor-rates under the old system. The adoption therefore of a system of permanent outdoor relief, chargeable upon landed estates, as Lord Lansdowne, one of the most munificent proprietors in Ireland, said in his place in Parliament, "*must lead to the complete confiscation of the property of Ireland.*"

As the pecuniary burdens of landlords are increased, rents will be raised, till tenants who are now barely able to eke out a support for themselves and their families, will be reduced to the level of paupers. The poor cottier, whose diet is far inferior to that of the work-house which he is taxed so heavily to support, will ask himself whether the pride of earning his own living is worth what it costs; and when pauperism, like insolvency under a general bankrupt law, is no longer a disgrace, pride will no longer be a restraint. Any material increase of the poor-rate, by depressing still more the landed proprietors and the tenant farmers, would inevitably swell the list of claimants upon the public bounty.

Under the act referred to, soup kitchens were established in the

more destitute districts, where boiled stirabout was dealt out to those who were entitled to out-door relief. In July, 1847, more than *three millions* thus received their daily rations. Twenty thousand persons were on the relief lists in the northern half of Dublin. It seemed necessary, in the extraordinary crisis of that year, that government should interpose for the immediate relief of the people. The failure of the potato crop, left four millions of people as absolutely unprovided for, as if the population of the island had been suddenly increased by that amount, without any increase of the means of subsistence. The case was urgent; and we can not but admire the promptness and energy with which the British ministry endeavored to meet it. Still, great errors were committed and dangerous precedents were established, in the attempt to relieve present misery.

In the autumn of 1845, when the potato blight first became general, Sir Robert Peel, then at the head of affairs, ordered the importation of Indian corn from the United States, to the amount of £100,000. This large supply of cheap and wholesome food, was judiciously distributed during the ensuing winter, and prevented much distress. Other arrangements were also made by the government, to meet the anticipated demand for food. But it was soon perceived that such action on the part of the government, would in the end increase the evil it was designed to remedy; for when once it should be understood, that government would enter the market in competition with individual enterprise for the sake of cheapening breadstuffs, there would be such a falling off from the usual importations, that the whole supply in the country, would be far less than in ordinary years. There being a general deficiency of the crops in Europe, and freights being high, but

one thing could ensure for Great Britain an adequate supply of flour and grain: viz. a higher price than could be obtained elsewhere. Had government by large importations to be disposed of at reduced rates, cheapened the price of breadstuffs, the importation by other parties would have ceased; the supply in private hands would have been exhausted; and government must have undertaken to feed the entire nation, or England must have shared with Ireland, the horrors of famine. Price, and price only, could regulate the supply. Even in the midst of the famine, breadstuffs were exported from England to France, because the price was temporarily higher in the latter country.

Wisely, therefore, did the British government conclude to leave the supply of breadstuffs to the natural laws of trade, taking pains only to remove the unnatural restrictions which a false political economy had imposed upon trade in corn. The result was most happy. The high price of breadstuffs stimulated importation, until with a rapidly increasing supply, the demand became less active, and both freights and prices went down. In the first six months of 1847, nearly three millions of quarters were imported into Great Britain and Ireland. If government had cheapened breadstuffs, at the first, by heavy importations on its own account, the reverse of all this would have occurred.

But while free trade thus regulated the supply of the nation at large, there was a difficulty in the organization of Irish society, which could not be so easily overcome. In many parts of the country, the ordinary channels of trade had never been opened, and the use of money, except in payment of taxes and rent, was hardly known. "The people whose food was gone were, in fact, beyond the pale of all mercantile system—they had lived upon the produce of their potato-gardens,

and had been customers of no shop." They existed, as in the Gweedore district, in a state of absolute isolation; having neither markets, stores, nor money. To meet this state of things, there was a call for the ubiquitous agency of government; and yet there was danger, that any measures of relief, by giving the people exaggerated notions of the resources of government, and by conceding that the poor were entitled to support from the national treasury, would establish a troublesome precedent. So, in fact, it proved. It is said, that in one of the most destitute parts of Ireland, the people neglected to lay in their winter's supply of turf, because it was reported, that the Queen intended to supply them with coals. This is the natural result of the policy of supplying the poor with work or with bread from the public treasury. The doctrine that government must make provision for the support of the laboring classes—the old cry of "*Panem et Circenses*"—has threatened with overthrow the National Assembly of France. It is not the doctrine that will operate as a panacea for the evils of Ireland. No such temporizing expedient can meet the case. An extraordinary emergency demanded extraordinary measures. A time of famine was hardly the fit time for an experiment in political economy. As society is constituted in Ireland, there was an opportunity for government to interpose for the relief of the famishing in certain districts, without disturbing the laws of trade; in fact, it was in the power of government, by purchasing at home, greatly to encourage the trade in breadstuffs, and to open new channels for the supply of all parts of the country. There was also a duty which the government owed to Ireland, in consideration of past abuses. But now that the corn laws and the navigation laws have yielded to the demands of a starving na-

tion, and the corn trade is fully open to private enterprise; it is to be hoped, for the sake of the future prosperity of Ireland, that government will neither assume the support of the destitute, nor attempt to compel it by an increased tax on land. As a general rule, there should be no public provision for the able-bodied poor.

A most important government measure for the temporary relief of Ireland, was the employment of the people upon public works. These works were undertaken for the purpose of giving the able-bodied poor an opportunity to earn their bread by labor. By the provisions of the Labor-rate Act, "in every barony which the Lord Lieutenant proclaimed in a state of distress, extraordinary presentment sessions were to be held, at which the magistrates and cess-payers were to have the power of presenting for public works to an indefinite extent, subject only to the control of the Board of Works. The sums so presented were to be at once advanced by the Treasury, to be replaced by instalments that would spread the repayment of the entire, with interest, over a period varying, at the discretion of the Treasury, from four to twenty years." Under this system, public works were commenced upon such a gigantic scale, that the Board of Works soon had in their employment as superintendents, clerks, &c., one thousand two hundred subordinate officers, and were in receipt of eight hundred business letters *per diem*. The common people, men, women and children, flocked to the roads for employment, till in March, 1847, there were nearly 750,000 laborers on the public works, (an increase since January of about 200,000,) making, with their families, between two and three millions, that were dependent upon the works for subsistence. Much imposition was practised. Many of the laborers too were in a sickly and starv-

ing condition, and their tasks were merely nominal. Says one of the most active officers of the Board, "rest one could never have, night nor day, when one felt that in every minute lost, a score of men might die."

Of course such a system could not long be maintained. In fact the government was obliged to abandon it, while many of the works were in an unfinished state. It answered the purpose of saving multitudes from starvation; but in almost every other respect the measure was attended with enormous evils. The public works were for the most part unproductive, though in some sections they may be useful hereafter. The primary object of the works being, not the improvement of the country, but the employment of the people, and the nature and extent of the works being left very much to the decision of the local sessions, as a matter of course many works were undertaken, which were not called for by the wants of the public. At the same time labor was, by this means, diverted from objects of general and permanent utility, while, in the strong language of Mr. Butt,\* "upwards of two millions of people, were supported in laborious idleness by a taxation upon the country. They knew that the labor was but a pretence for giving them wages, and they made as little of the pretence as possibly would suffice. Hence the public works became schools of idleness, in which men met to teach each other how little it was possible to do in a day's work. The indolence which the long absence of the proper rewards of industry has fostered into a national habit, supplied but too ready pupils to these normal schools of busy idleness, until men have absolutely been known to refuse higher wages from the farmers with whom they must have labored to earn the

money, and prefer the lower wages and dignified ease of laborers upon the public works." Some have even been known to hurrah for the famine, as the occasion of their being provided for by the government.

The immense outlay upon these unprofitable works to be refunded by taxation must cripple the resources of landholders for years to come, and thus delay the recovery of the country from the recent calamity.

The policy of the government's providing the people with work, is second in mischief only to that of providing them with bread. The public works of 1847, will long remain a stupendous monument of misdirected charity. While the spirit with which they were undertaken, the energy with which they were prosecuted, and the relief which they actually afforded, must reflect honor upon the British ministry, the final results of the system must cast no less opprobrium upon the principle of legislation for labor.

The one grand measure of the Irish themselves for the relief of their country, is the repeal of the legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland. This is especially demanded by the Roman Catholics; the Protestants, who represent the wealth and the intelligence of the country, have generally been opposed to it. But the infatuated policy of British statesmen toward Ireland, has produced in thoughtful minds of every sect, a feeling of deep anxiety respecting the future relations of the two countries. On this subject, "the Dublin University Magazine" holds the following language: "A little more of insult and contumely heaped upon the Irish people; a little more disregard of Irish interests and feeling in legislation; a little more treatment of Ireland as a conquered country, to be parceled out in legislation as pleases her masters, and he would be a bold

\* "A Voice for Ireland," pp. 14 and 15.

man who would promise many years' continuance of the union."

With the masses of the people, the constant cry is for "repeal;" and now that the great magician has departed, it is difficult for the leaders of the agitation to conduct it as peacefully as when it was under his absolute control. In fact the "physical force" party, the men who would trust in the pike rather than in argument, are plainly the vast majority of the people.

Ignorant as the mass of the Irish must be, with respect to the bearings of this grave political question upon the welfare of their country; we can not but respect the firmness with which they have adhered to their cause, and appreciate the sacrifices which they have made for the sake of it. Mrs. Nicholson mentions the following incident, as an illustration of the general feeling of the people. "Seeing a repeal button in the coat of a man standing by his car, I inquired, 'Do you find employment, sir?'

'But little, ma'am; I suffer much, and get little. O'Connell has worked hard for us, and is now in jail. I'm waitin' here for a job, and the thief of a fellow won't get on to my car with my repeal button in sight. But I will wear it. Oh! the country's dyin'; it's starvin'; it's kilt. And O'Connell won't let us fight, and I spose that's the best way.'

On some of the main routes, she found "Conservative" and "Radical" or "Repeal" coaches; and she was often consulted as an oracle, as to the probability of "the repeale."

We have no time now to enter into the history of the union. Undoubtedly there have been evils connected with it; the greatest of which has been, the lack of a genuine Irish sympathy in a Court and Parliament seated at London, and under the overwhelming influence of British interests. But the practical difficulty, after all, has been

the *want* of union. Ireland has not been treated as an integral part of the empire; she has been governed too much as a conquered and dependent province. If this policy is to continue, the sooner the union is severed the better. But this policy is not to prevail. British statesmen are beginning to acknowledge the just claims of Ireland, and the English people are demanding that those claims shall be regarded. Ireland is yet to realize the benefits of her union with Great Britain. Prostrated as she has been for centuries, she can not now act independently, on the strength of her own credit and resources; she needs the credit and the resources of the whole empire, to enable her to recover from the terrible shock of famine.

The most intimate and amicable relationship between the two countries, is essential to the prosperity of both. Ireland could not peaceably exist as an independent government, by the side of a British monarchy. Should the British constitution be overthrown, and a republic be proclaimed at St. James's, then the two nations might exist independently, or under one federal government. But we apprehend no such change; and a separate Parliament in Ireland, would be as of old, the theater for political intrigue and rebellion.

It was sententiously remarked by Thomas Paine,\* as an argument for the independence of the colonies, "that Britain was too jealous of America to govern it justly; too ignorant of it to govern it well; and too distant from it, to govern it at all." Jealousy and ignorance exist in England with respect to Ireland; but Ireland is not too remote from England to be an integral part of the British empire. If it should be regarded as such; if instead of Great Britain *and* Ireland, with separate

\* The Crisis.

interests and separate legislation, there should be an entire community of interest and of feeling; if instead of a union of coercion, there should be a union of sympathy and of confidence, Ireland could have nothing to hope for from repeal. The union would be emphatically her strength. Even now, with a population one half that of England, Ireland is taxed only one tenth as much; and she has every thing to gain from a continuance of the union upon right terms, and in a truly liberal and fraternal spirit. There is something better for Ireland than repeal.

Those who are zealous for the establishment of republican institutions in Ireland, overlook the facts, that the Irish are not a homogeneous people; that the nation is composed of distinct races with hereditary antipathies; that religious and sectional prejudices are exceedingly violent; that the country is impoverished; that the people are ignorant; and that every thing is as far as possible from that condition of order, of stability, of plenty, of peace, of union and confidence, which is essential to the success of a republican government. It was one thing for intelligent and pious men, few in number, and possessing the same general traits of character, to establish liberal institutions upon a new soil, three thousand miles away from any existing government, and for their descendants reared under those institutions, to defend them from foreign usurpation; and it would be quite another thing to give such institutions in a moment, to eight millions of people, proverbially reckless and excitable, who have been accustomed to look to government as at once the cause and the remedy of all their evils, and who are even now upon the brink of starvation. We tremble at the thought of such an experiment.

With the light which we now possess, we can not join in the cry for repeal—though the very next steam-

er may convince us of its necessity. Our hope is that it may at least be deferred until the physical condition of the country is so far improved, that repeal shall not be the signal for universal pillage, and until the moral grievances of the country are so far redressed, that the immense Catholic majority with full power in their hands, shall have no pretext for waging a war of extermination against Protestants.

But no measure can bring efficient and permanent relief to Ireland short of the entire reconstitution of society. This must be the work of time, and the result of various influences. As so many of the evils of Ireland are to be traced to a vicious system of land-holding, it is at this point that reform must begin. And here it may be necessary for government itself to resort to extreme and even revolutionary measures; in particular, to empower the court of chancery to effect sales of great estates which are now encumbered with mortgages, jointures and entail. This should be done of course with as much regard for the rights of all parties as the necessity of the case will admit. The effect of such a measure would be gradually to abolish estates-tail, and to bring into the market immense tracts of land which are now of little benefit either to the owner or to the country, their income being swallowed up by liabilities or expended abroad. These tracts being divided into farms of suitable extent, would pass into the hands of resident landlords, whose interest it would be to improve their own estates and the general condition of the country. Small holdings and especially the system of con-acre should be abolished, and the laborer—for whose services there would be an increased demand—should be paid in money, which would enable him in turn to procure the comforts of life.

That this scheme is not chimeri-

cal, is plain from the experiment of Lord George Hill, in the Gweedore district on the sea-shore of Donegal, referred to on p. 269. In that district, nine thousand people resided without a market, without a store, and without many of the necessities of life. After Lord George came into possession of the property by purchase, he endeavored to abolish the system of petty leases for the sake of introducing a better. At first he met with much opposition from the ignorant tenantry, who supposed that he meant to deprive them of their rights. But beginning with a few, he caused cabins to be erected at regular intervals, and the land belonging to each to be marked off by ditches, so that each tenant might know his own boundaries. Next he erected a store at which he agreed to purchase at the market price, oats and other produce, engaging to sell in turn at the lowest rates whatever commodities the tenantry should need. What now was the result? In 1839, there was paid at the store for oats raised upon the premises, £479 9s. 6*1/2*d., and in 1844, £1100. In 1840, there were among the tenantry thirty-six competitors for agricultural prizes; and in 1844, there were two hundred and thirty-nine. Contrast this state of things with the description of Gweedore given in our last article, and see whether the renovation of Ireland is impossible.

“Tuscany was once in the same destitute state as Ireland. But by an arrangement with the nobles, what is called the Meteyer system of husbandry was introduced; the principle of which is the following. The landlord, in addition to the land, finds houses, oxen, and farming implements, and the tenant seed, labor, and other necessaries. In other words, the landlord finds the capital—the tenant the labor. The crop is then equally divided, the tenant taking one half, the landlord the other. From the time that this impetus was given to industry, the land

has gone on steadily improving, and in this way land within ten or twelve miles of Florence returns 3 per cent. and beyond that distance 4*1/2* per cent. to the landlord.”\*

Some such scheme as this, by which capital can be well employed and labor well rewarded, is what is needed in Ireland. The first great requisite is *capital*—capital to be invested upon the soil, so that the laboring classes can find employment for wages. But in order that capital should be invested in Ireland, instead of being withdrawn to be employed in England, there must be confidence, security, *law*, a strong government. The present feverish state of Ireland is fatal to all plans of improvement. The government therefore, having first gained the confidence of the people by reasonable concessions, should favor judicious systems of improvement in agriculture, in trade, and in manufactures. In our own country we prefer to leave these things to private enterprise. They do not properly fall within the province of government. But with the British government in Ireland, every thing is an exception. Government must as far as possible, repair the evils of the unwholesome legislation of centuries. For example; we have seen how Parliament in the reign of William III. prohibited woollen manufactures in Ireland. It was a small compensation for this that the linen manufactures were fostered; for the seat of these manufactures was Ulster, so that the Protestant interest was fostered at the expense of the Catholic. These prohibitions have now been removed, but it is the duty of government, by way of atonement, to encourage the manufacturing interest of Ireland till it shall be established upon a firm foundation.

But the encouragement of government should not be limited to

\* Laing's “Notes of a traveler in France, Italy,” &c. Quoted by Browne.

any one interest. The agriculture of Ireland is capable of much improvement. The soil could probably be made to produce three times its present returns. But cultivation should not be stimulated beyond capital, or beyond the demands of the market. It should be made for the private interest of the landlord and of the tenant to develop the agricultural resources of the country in their fullest extent. This may be facilitated by government bounties, and more especially by agricultural societies. But the grand measure of government for this purpose, should be the construction of railroads, judiciously located, which should bring the remote parts of the country near to a market. If one half the money squandered upon public works that will either be wholly unproductive, or the benefit of which can not be realized for years, if one-half or one-fourth that sum had been given to encourage the building of railroads, while the same incidental benefit of affording labor to the destitute poor would have been secured, Ireland would have been furnished with those means of easy and cheap intercommunication which are the life of enterprise and of trade.

Something may be done also for the improvement of fisheries, for the encouragement of mining, and for the reclaiming of waste lands by draining and by other agencies.

In all this it may be thought that we are prescribing a Herculean task to the British government. But our suggestions cover a wide range and do not leave out the important element of time. Much of what we have now proposed could be gradually accomplished by private enterprise, aided by the sanction and the credit of government. But the hand of government must be distinctly seen in these reforms, to inspire confidence and to ensure success. The great problem is, "How to transform a nation of paupers into

laborers for wages?" This plainly must be the work of time. But a prerequisite to it is the restoration of quiet and order in the country. And in order to this, the government must enter in good faith upon the business of ameliorating the condition of Ireland, as the first great work to be accomplished. It must feel that it has something else to do in Ireland besides silencing the mouth of sedition, and overawing the spirit of insurrection. In the sententious language of one of her own sons, what is now needed for Ireland is, "*less politics and more ploughing, less argument and more action, less debating and more doing.*"\*

Facilities for emigration to the colonies would yield some present relief to Ireland. The emigration to this country is already quite as large as is consistent with the good either of the country or of the emigrants themselves.

We have devoted so much space to the physical condition of Ireland, that we can not now enter at length upon the topics of education and religion as related to the improvement of her people, but the necessity for the general education and for the thorough evangelization of the people of Ireland is so obvious as to require no comment. The system of national schools is working admirably, so that there are few of the rising generation in Ireland who can not read. The lad of whom we spoke at the beginning of our article, had saved out of the wreck of poverty itself, a library comprising the Bible, the Catechism, the Book of Common Prayer, bound volumes of tracts, a grammar, a geography, *Young's Night Thoughts*, and *the Lady of the Lake*. These he unrolled from a torn and dirty handkerchief, with evident pride. His education was that of the national school. Mrs. Nicholson testifies that

\* Richard Bourke.

the national schools are doing much good. We trust that Tullaghobeg-ley itself has shared in the general improvement at Gweedore.

The evangelization of Ireland is yet to be undertaken in such a spirit and with such resources as shall warrant the expectation of success. The system of church dependence upon the state being abolished in every form, and the word of God, with the Bible-reader and the itiner-

ant missionary being sent everywhere through the land, we may look for the emancipation even of the Roman Catholic mind, and the moral regeneration of Ireland.

We turn toward the emerald isle with hope; we wait with patience; believing that she will yet shine forth from the mists that surround her, as one of the brightest gems of the sea.

#### THE MISSION OF LABOR.

AGRICULTURAL Chemistry is throwing light upon the work of subduing the earth. It is doubtful whether any mind has received the full import of the command of God to Adam,—' Go forth from the garden, and till the ground.' Doubtless Adam thought it a hard sentence. It wore the aspect of a heavy curse. Thenceforward he was to toil in the sweat of his brow, and not merely to dress the garden. In the earth before him lay his means of subsistence, and he must win it by severe labor. Heretofore his work had been easy; for God had made every thing ready at his hands. He had only to pluck and eat. Now he must dig or starve. A flaming sword guarded the entrance to Eden;—he could not go back. He was forced out. Toil was now his lot; for a tough soil was to be cultivated, a thorny earth to be subdued. No terrestrial paradise, unless hard work could make one, was any longer possible for man. When God spoke to Adam, he spoke to the race. The doctrine of federal headship is true here, if false elsewhere. Adam received his commission of labor, as the representative of his race. In speaking to him, God addressed the whole family of man. And the import of his words, is this;—

'There is the world before you; it is your field of labor. You will find in it all the materials for your subsistence, though, in consequence of sin, it will yield its support only to constant toil. Enter this field and subdue it. Labor is necessary to your health, your happiness, and above all, to your character. Make the rough places smooth; the crooked, straight; the barren, fruitful. Your course must henceforth be one of toil and sorrow, alleviated with many comforts and joys; flowers you will find, though thorns will everywhere spring up. The whole earth is yours,—subdue it all. By faithfully doing this work, you will acquire not only a livelihood but mental and moral discipline. Idleness and ease will prove injurious, both to your physical and moral nature. You have been taught how the ground should be cultivated. Make it all beautiful like Eden; and in that consummation earth and man shall be restored from their ruin, the mission of labor be accomplished, and the praise of God be universal.'

Were it within the compass of our plan, we might show from numerous passages of Scripture, that such is the import of God's sending our race forth to till the earth. We believe the earth is to be worked.

back into a garden like Eden, highly cultivated and fruitful, where every thing shall abound that can minister to human happiness. We believe also that the work of subduing the earth will keep pace with the progress of the race in all that is lovely and of good report, because God has appointed this work as one essential means of the elevation and perfection of man. If on account of the fall, God made the world a hard field of labor for man's good; if hard toil is a necessary means of his recovery, which all grant;—then, it is not too much to suppose that, as the race advances in industry and skill, and as progress is made in the art of cultivation, the time will come when the whole earth will be a garden, and the entire race happy. The latter event is clearly predicted, and in this prediction the other is embraced. We may also confidently anticipate it as the result of causes already in operation. Thus far in the history of the world the subjugation of the earth has kept pace with the general improvement of our race. Every event which has promoted the advancement of man toward his primitive character has resulted in a corresponding improvement of the earth; and every discovery and invention which have imparted a new impulse to agriculture, has also reacted favorably upon human progress. Guizot asserts this fact in his history of civilization. And the fact is more apparent now than it has hitherto been. Man who was taken from the earth, has his destiny in this life linked with that of the earth. Melioration in his physical and social condition is indispensable to his intellectual and moral advancement; and he can find such melioration only in a more general and perfect cultivation of the soil. More properly, perhaps, it might be said that such progress in the cultivation of the soil is itself an intellectual and moral advance-

ment; for God never designed the tilling of the earth any more than the dressing of the garden, to be a mere work of the hands;—the mind and heart were to be cultivated by the same means. But these points will come in more naturally in another connection, and we proceed to offer such considerations, (waiving the argument from the Scriptures,) as convince us that man's mission of labor implies the complete subjugation of the earth; that fertility and beauty are yet to take the place of barrenness and deformity, to the extent of changing the whole earth into an Eden.

The means for realizing this change are inexhaustible. Thanks to agricultural chemistry, and other kindred sciences, for putting the fact beyond dispute, that there is no exhausting the productive resources of the earth. Indolence and ignorance of the art of cultivation may long continue to "run out" the richest lands; but it is now demonstrated that intelligent labor can readily restore their fertility. The Maker of the earth has provided, and everywhere distributed, the means of making it indefinitely productive. Within it and around upon its surface, science points to materials in unmeasured quantities, and of easy access, sufficient to produce an abundance of the necessaries and luxuries of life, for any amount of population: and also for every purpose of taste and ornament. The pleasure and improvement arising from the proper use of these means, are the sure inheritance of the future. God has indeed left man to work out for himself this destiny. But in this he manifests his benevolence. He designs that we should have the pleasure of discovery to lighten our toil, and labor fit to exercise our faculties. Otherwise labor would have been a double curse. He provides the materials and gives us capacity to discover and use them. Man was placed after the

fall in a part of the world where he could easily gain a subsistence. Then he knew comparatively little of the necessary conditions of the most productive crops. Nearly six thousand years have passed away, without any great progress in subduing the earth. For the earth, dependent upon man for its culture, can not advance faster than its cultivator. And the "progress of the species," thus far, gives little occasion for boasting. But let us hope. Nature must have time. God is never in haste. With him a thousand years are as one day.

By means of chemical experiments upon the nature of soils, and the constituent elements of all kinds of animal and vegetable productions, more real progress has been made in the science of cultivation within a few years than during all the centuries of the past. What is called the age of discovery is passed, and that of invention, experiment, induction and genuine "Baconian fruit," has arrived. The whole earth has been discovered. Any school-boy can open his atlas and point to every continent and island, every ocean, lake and stream, accurately laid down. That work is done, and Columbus may rest in peace. The next great problem is, How can the earth be subdued? Its equitable division among nations and individuals, is a subordinate question; though what battle-fields and law-suits lie in the way of its final settlement! We turn from these contests praying for their mitigation, and look with hope to the peaceful and beneficent array of geologists, chemists and practical scientific agriculturists, armed with hammers, retorts and spades, the van of an innumerable host of strong and cheerful men who bear aloft upon their standard the motto—*"Let the earth be subdued for man."* This body of men from civilized nations, is destined to march through all lands. And what a declaration

of rights have they put forth! "God gave this earth to man, for his support; it is his field of labor and enjoyment. Not only his physical necessities, but his happiness and virtue require that it should be appropriated according to this original design. It must not, it shall not be forever turned into a field of slaughter, or kept from cultivation for the gratification of the few, while the millions need it for their sustenance. Let it be subdued, tilled, dressed, like Eden, for there are means of doing it."

A few facts are now settled—enough to show that no insurmountable obstacles lie in the way of what may be considered perfect cultivation. It is known what the soil, or what the properties of the soil, must be, to secure any particular crop in the greatest abundance. A few elementary substances—or what are called such—compose everything within and around us. The rock and the lily, the savory draught and the metal goblet which contains it, the sickle, the grain and the reaper, the costly diamond and the black coal upon the hearth, contain some of the same elements in different degrees and combinations. The mineral has been analyzed, and its component parts discovered so accurately, that the analyzer having obtained the elements from other substances, has produced the mineral itself. It has been demonstrated, that all parts of the animal body are found in the food which nourishes it. And that the elements of this food are contained in the earth, (always taking into view what is furnished by air and water.) That is, what is called the "principle of life" in man or in animals, produces nothing. All that is appropriated by the life-process in the growth and support of living bodies, must be introduced. It is still literally true that man comes from the earth, and in his physical nature remains strictly earthy. The cheap-

ist goes into our gardens, fields, orchards and vineyards, and finds there, first in the soil and then in its productions, all the elements of our bodies. He analyzes what he finds, and tells us the purposes to which they are adapted in the economy of living. He shows that the soil must be replenished by the same substances which the cultivator annually takes from it. A part of the same crop must be returned, in some form, to the field, or the same elementary substances must be brought in from other sources. Otherwise the earth will refuse its increase, and man's labor will be lost. Different productions may be gathered, successively, from a field without this replenishing process; for the soil may contain all the various elements of their growth. But we see, every year, millions of tons of produce gathered from the land, and carried to the marts of commerce and trade, which, in no form, can be returned. They are not only consumed, but wasted. How, then, can this waste be supplied, and renewed fertility be restored to the soil? Science gives the answer. It conducts the laborer to a neighboring bog or marsh, or hill or shore; or points him to still deeper strata of the same land where the plough has never reached; or it may be, sends the ship to distant islands and countries; and shows him that there is no want of materials—that, with an amount of labor and expense which he can well afford, he may continue the productive energy of his land. Agricultural science directs the attention of the farmer to numerous sources of waste which ignorance alone would allow; shows how he can combine various substances already at hand, with which to enrich his land; and conducts him unerringly to the crops to which his soil is best suited. Taking a specimen of his soil into the laboratory, it tests, by analysis, its power of produc-

tion, and reveals the kind of crop which it will produce most abundantly. It detects the causes of failure or of partial success, tells wherein labor is misapplied, and relieves cultivation from much useless anxiety and drudgery. All the elements of production and growth in the vegetable and animal world, are indestructible. Separation and reunion, metamorphosis and change, decay and growth, death and life, are constantly occurring in all the million forms of earth. But no particle of matter is ever lost, no one element ever loses its relative proportion,—the equilibrium is never destroyed. Succession is endless. Annihilation is unknown. Fertility may take the place of barrenness, the most loathsome objects may be changed to forms of beauty, the elements of pestilence and death in the atmospheres, may be made to give place to the sweetest odors. There is often but a slight difference in the elements of the most opposite products. Man can breathe the same air but once; for him its life-property is soon gone. But the lungs of the vegetable world thankfully receive it, appropriate its deadly element, and restore it to man in its original purity. The meadows and forests, the world over—such is the wise arrangement of God—are imparting a life element to animals and men, and are receiving from them a never failing means of their own existence. Every ocean, sea, lake and pond, by means of vegetable productions at their bottom, keep a pure air for the fish which swim in them. By an atmosphere forty miles deep the Deity has provided against all possibility of failure in some of the most essential properties of life and growth; while as ample provision is made for other elements by two and a half acres of water for the irrigation of every acre of land. These mighty reservoirs of water are so distributed and so construct-

ed as most effectually to secure their beneficent design. The sun is constantly changing portions of this water to vapor, the atmosphere holds it in this state and wafts it over our meadows and fields, that it may descend in fertilizing showers. The springs, veins, streams and rivers return it again to the great fountains; thus it can never be lost and never fail. These are some of the most obvious means which God has provided, for subduing the earth to fertility and beauty. But others, no less simple and no less grand, are brought to view by geological research. The science of geology no less than that of astronomy has its wonders, awaking the sublimest emotions. Having no fear that the revelations of geology can contradict the book of Genesis, we may contemplate, with delight, the wonderful formation of our globe: how it has been in a process of preparation for the habitation of man, it may be, for many millions of years or eons: how it has been gradually made a fit theater for the abode and development of our race. We have but just begun exploring its resources; yet we have discovered means of fertilizing the earth which no amount of population, and no length of time can possibly exhaust. It is when we look into the earth, even more than when we examine its surface and its atmosphere, that we begin to understand the import of man's mission of labor. We then feel convinced that God provided these ample resources for subduing the earth, by processes so wonderful, and requiring periods of such incalculable duration, that they might be used. And when we contemplate what a world of beauty they are capable of making, what a race they can sustain, and what improvement their development would furnish to man, we believe—and our belief is confirmed by revelation—that they will be used.

*Man is adequate to the task.* Impelled by his physical necessities, his native desire for progress and improvement, his innate regard for property, and his love of research and experiment; having intelligence to call art and science to his aid, and to invent every convenient implement of labor; having dominion also over animals, and over fire, air and water; who can doubt his ability to subdue the earth? With less real effort, and with far less expense, than it has cost men to fight their battles, all the deserts of our globe could have been turned into Edens, even if it had been necessary to level the mountains to do it. A race that can subsist, as man has subsisted, upon the labor of one in ten, with the poorest implements of agriculture, by mere brute force, and at the same time has built pyramids and cities of marble in the desert, and spent one year in every five in mutual destruction,—such a race is surely competent to garden the earth. With our imperfect agricultural knowledge, and still more imperfect practice, the labor of one-tenth of the present population, expended upon the soil, would furnish ample support for the whole race. Hitherto but a small part of the labor of mankind has been expended for necessities. Much the heaviest part of the expense of living, has arisen from folly, vice and crime. In the most enlightened and civilized nations, from the earliest period to the present, if the mass of the people have toiled hard, it has been, not simply for their comfortable subsistence, but in consequence of the enormous drafts made upon them both by their own vices and by their ecclesiastical and civil rulers. War has done more than necessities of food and clothing to impoverish the world. When we consider how much of time nations have wasted in war, the cost of preparation, the destruction of property, the devastation caused by hostile armies—it is wonderful that

the race has not become extinct. If in such a state of society, population could increase, and be supported, what may we not expect in an age of peace, art, science and industry. Man is not always to waste his energies in strife and licentiousness. Slow as his progress is, he is growing wiser. Terrible as the struggle has been, terrible as it still is, and for centuries promises to be, the mass of the people are yet to be elevated. The universal conviction of civilized nations, the providence of God in the overthrow of tyrannical governments, and in the establishment of popular institutions—right, reason, justice, conscience, prophecy—every thing—proclaims this to be the destiny of the Human race. We are not wandering into Utopia, but are still surrounded by the familiar landmarks of our own part of the world, while we see the shadows of a coming state of society lovelier and better than has yet been known. In causes already in operation, the progressive state of the useful arts and sciences, the general and thorough education of the people, the efforts made for the suppression of vice, we have a pledge of human advancement surpassing all the experience of the past, realizing all our predictions of the future. If prophecy did not point to this universal elevation of the race, the events of the last three centuries would lead us to expect it. Every improvement from the printing press to the telegraph, has pointed in this direction. A better cultivation of the earth must follow the progress of man in intelligence and virtue. Human life will be more secure; as a race, man will live longer; his body will be more vigorous; he will be more willing to labor and know how to labor to better advantage; his taste will be more refined; and his love of the beautiful will prompt him to adorn the earth which he cultivates. The race will be multiplied many fold, and every man will want

not only the necessities of life, but all that can minister to his comfort and enjoyment—and the result must be, the renovation of the earth. The wilderness will be turned into a garden. The desert will blossom as the rose. Notwithstanding the devastations of war, famine, pestilence and vice, the present population of the earth is supposed to be about nine hundred millions. It has been calculated that North America might support the whole, without any improvements in agriculture. So long as there are millions of fertile acres uncultivated and tens of millions which can readily be made fertile, "no measures need be devised to suppress population," or to kill off the surplus. Where there is thought to be a redundancy of population, it is demonstrable that if all the land were allowed to be cultivated, double the number of inhabitants could be supported. In Ireland one-eighth of the population, we are told, have died for want of subsistence. But not a fourth of the soil is under cultivation. Previous to the French Revolution of 1790, starvation was common among the peasantry; more dying for want of bread every year, than were killed during the reign of terror. And the cry of "over-population," was heard; but it came from those whose hunting grounds, if cultivated, would have given abundance to every family. Some parts of Europe, and the southern part of Asia, are thickly populated; though by no means in proportion to the capabilities of the soil. But what shall we say of North and South America, Central and Northern Asia, Africa, New Holland, Russia, and the islands of the Ocean? In all these countries there is the smallest fraction of population compared with what the land might sustain. We say this, of those tracts which can be tilled with comparative ease, and with the means already in use. But let agricultural science and the physical force which han-

hitherto been expended in war, crime and folly, be applied to the work of cultivating the soil, and scarcely a mountain top or sandy desert can withstand the onset. If any state in Europe will for a century to come, make the effort to cultivate the soil, which it has expended in war alone, every acre of land will wear the aspect of a fertile field. Richard Arkwright has already a monument to his memory more glorious than any ancient conqueror. Professor Liebig shall be called blessed long after military heroism has ceased to be eulogized.

The tables are turning. A new era has dawned. The world is squaring accounts with feudalism, and tyranny; the reckoning may be long and difficult, perhaps fearful, for the conviction is keen that there has been foul play. But of the final result there can be no doubt. Society will assume new forms, become cemented by new and nobler interests, and aim at nobler objects. We are not disposed to be severe, much less revengeful, towards the past. We see much to praise. We are not unmindful that we are reaping many rich harvests, the result of past toil and suffering. We well know that we are still tolerating some of the sorest evils which have cursed the race. Perfection, in every thing, is of slow growth. It required many geological ages to prepare the world for man—to perfect its strata, to make ready its soil. These were ages of commotion and attrition. It was necessary that it should be thus with the growth and perfection of society. But while we gaze with mingled emotions of sadness and sublimity at the fearful grandeur of the revolutions and plunges of the sweltering chaos, we contemplate the fertility and beauty, the quiet and blessedness of the final result with unmingled delight. That it will always be necessary to have these convulsions continue—these scenes of des-

olation acted over, to keep the moral world from stagnation, we can not believe. We look for the promised age of peace, when it shall be the ambition of rulers and subjects, to subdue the earth to such a state of fertility. In that day the greatness of a nation will depend on the amount of its productive industry. Gunpowder will be still needed to blast rocks and level mountains—not to desolate kingdoms. Great men will still pant for "deeds of great renown." But glory will lie in a new direction. The world will continue to honor its heroes, but they will be of a different character. In that day men will be praised for the blessings they confer and not for the miseries they inflict.

One great feature of this approaching change will be the more equal division of land, and consequently its more thorough cultivation. The tendency of all modern revolutions is to this result. In many countries no change for the better can possibly take place without it. No other cause has operated so powerfully in Europe to impoverish the people as the monopoly of the soil by a few proprietors. The laborer has had to toil for a pittance under the pressure of rents and taxes, a tenth part of which would drive a New Englander mad. And yet under these hard conditions, the laboring class has lived and multiplied. What then may not be accomplished under a better arrangement—such as we enjoy in this country—perfected by experience—securing to every industrious man a chance of bettering his condition—of becoming a landholder—of owning the spot he cultivates? Then may we expect him to make his house the abode of plenty. A man may support himself and nine others, with no unusual means of cultivation and within the ordinary hours of labor. But improvements in the art of agriculture will be made. Institutions have been

endowed for the purpose. We are yet to have not only professors of agriculture in the University, but the practical applications of science to tillage, are to be taught in our public schools. We have no opinion to express as to the extent that land will be subdivided and owned by the cultivator. Theories upon this point are useless. When God distributed Palestine among the Hebrews, He made provision for each tribe and family. And from the law respecting the restoration of forfeited or alienated land at stated periods, we know that He designed a good degree of equality. The abolition of the laws of entail as connected with primogeniture, would, in some countries, lead to the most beneficial results. A change in this one particular would affect the whole social state. We can not well see how legislation can do more for a people in respect to the division of land than it has done in our own country. The division of farms at the decease of the owner among his several heirs, is an admirable feature of our system. Our farmers generally, it is believed, expend their efforts upon too large a surface. The minute subdivision of land leads to a more thorough cultivation, so that production is thereby increased and the whole face of the country improved. Whether it would be wise to limit the ownership of land to a certain number of acres, to each individual, we do not pretend to decide. But if there is any foundation for what we have said respecting the progress of man, there is also for believing that not only nomadic tribes but great landholders must give place to those who will cultivate the soil. The earth must be laid open to the plough; and the laborer must be a freeman, tilling his own fields or receiving wages for his services to another. He who toils as a mere serf or slave, hopeless and heartless, is not the man to transform the wilderness into a gar-

den. He may dig from the earth a living for himself and his master, but he will not subdue the earth nor can he advance in knowledge and virtue like the free and cheerful laborer. Severe as God's curse upon the earth was, he did not doom it to be a slave plantation. Man has made it so to a melancholy extent. God's sentence was, that it should be a field of labor, that by means of labor man should earn his living and promote his welfare. Should the time ever come when all men labor for themselves in some useful calling, and avoid the vice of prodigality, every family will have an attractive home, and every mind be thoroughly educated. Let that time come. Let one change succeed another in the tenure of property, so long as any abuse remains to be corrected or any improvement to be made. Let the human race go upon their great mission of labor—tasking their utmost capacities—and forcing the reluctant earth into a luxuriant field.

We admit that in most countries there are apparently insuperable obstacles in the way of a more equal division of land—such a division and ownership as shall lead to the most thorough and profitable cultivation of the soil. Violent revolutions, we hope, will not be needed to effect this object. But it must be realized. We predict no absolute equality. Different degrees of wealth will continue as long as men differ in economy, enterprise and skill; and this will be till the end of time. But the monstrous inequality that has forced the mass of the race into hopeless poverty, must, in the course of events, come to an end. Or if a landed aristocracy is still to exist, it will be upon such conditions as shall give the laborer a full remuneration for his services and every encouragement to exertion.

What we have said has reference to the progress of society in civilized countries. If we can read the

destiny of civilized man, we know what must ultimately be that of half civilized and barbarous nations. The facilities of intercourse assure us of the final elevation of the whole family of man. The romance of *distance* is at an end. A man that has traveled ten thousand miles is no longer a curiosity. The charm is broken. Mankind are hastening, some for commercial purposes, and others impelled by humanity and Christian faith, to the remotest regions of the earth. The empire of the Great Khan has revealed its mysteries. Timbuctoo is no longer an Eldorado, but a poor emporium for salt, ivory and gums. The Niger now, like all sensible rivers, runs into the ocean. The earth with its inhabitants, is well known. Many of the most fertile and beautiful portions of the earth, once densely populated, are now desolate; barbarism has taken the place of ancient civilization. But science, and literature, art, commerce and Christianity, on visiting those slumbering nations will breathe into them a nobler life. They will carry with them elements of progress and permanency never before known. Peace instead of war will follow as a matter of principle as well as of policy, with industry and skill in its train; and the consequence will be an abundance of the material of living, of enjoyment, and of mental culture, for all classes, for the lowest as well as the highest. The few shall no longer enslave the many; but the earth shall be for man according to the original grant of the Creator. The natural fertility of Asia and Africa, and their inexhaustible resources for agricultural improvement, are awaiting the new life which Christianity and a higher civilization will impart to those benighted regions.

How soon our expectations will be realized, we do not pretend to foresee. The divine plan may, for aught we can say, require many

VOL. VI.

61

generations for its fulfillment. That the plan is far from being completed is evident. In this day many interpreters of the prophets are very sanguine and very impatient. They declare that they can not see any provision for time beyond a few years. But we find no such revelation in the word of God—no time specified when the earth shall be destroyed, or the present order of things changed. But we do find the Bible full of promises of an unknown future of universal righteousness; and every step of progress toward this result is a pledge that the earth shall again yield her increase—that every portion of it shall be subdued to the use of man. The Great Ruler of the world will take time to complete this plan. He finishes all that He begins. He would not commission man to subdue the earth and withdraw the commission as soon as man had learned the true science of cultivation. Nor would He send his servants to proclaim salvation to all nations, and recall them from the work as soon as they were commencing it in earnest. The clear tendency of things is towards a millennial state. There is progress. This progress has been growing more and more rapid for three centuries. It is a *general* progress,—embracing every thing that can elevate and bless mankind. We are just coming into possession of knowledge that will make this progress sure and permanent. And God will not stay its onward course till man's mission of labor is accomplished, and the race redeemed.

A day of peace is promised; and shall it not be as long as the days of war have been? A day of light, also; and shall it not be as bright as the night has been dark? Knowledge is to fill the earth; and will it not flow wherever there is ignorance to be enlightened? Sin has abounded; and grace shall much more abound. The sword is to be chang-

ed to a ploughshare—when and where? Not in the past, not in the present, but in the future. When that time shall come the whole earth will be subdued. The lion and the lamb will lie down together? Beautiful emblem! But of what? In what scene of earth's drama has the archetype been seen?

We have not come to it yet. The first act is not completed;—the last may be far distant, but at length the curtain will be raised—and the glorious panorama of a world, free, equal and fraternal, doing all their duty, and having all they want, shall be revealed.

### MARTIAL MEN AND MARTIAL BOOKS.\*

A WARLIKE as well as a lewd and effeminate age is known by its literature. We can not doubt that the reign of Charles II. was infamous for the licentiousness of the court and the people, when the books of that period so clearly evince the fact; when history recorded, without a blush, the debauchery and vile intrigues of the King and his ministers, and biography celebrated the exploits of the most depraved characters; when low satires and amatory songs became the popular poetry; when the drama exhibited, without a moral, shameful scenes of vice, and the performers were applauded in proportion to their skill in representing the basest passions; when the adventures of a Rochester and a Buckingham were themes of romance; when the elegant arts partook of the general corruption, music lent its "voluptuous swell" to the lascivious dances of lords and ladies, and painting was employed in the production of obscene pictures and in displaying the beauty of the king's mistresses; and though Milton lived in this degenerate age, among the writers of the day, "his muse appeared like the chaste lady of the Masque—lofty, spotless and serene." The age of chivalry was fruitful not only in deeds of valor and courtesy—in the adventures of roving knights, rapacious barones,

and the exploits of the crusaders, but in descriptions of battles and tournaments, tales of Arthur and Charlemagne, rules of chivalry, the martial legends of the monks, and the metrical fictions of the Trouveurs.

The heroic periods of our own country are marked by corresponding illuminations along the path of her literature. The war of the revolution, undertaken for the establishment of colonial rights, waged for independence, and won through valor and patriotism, closed amidst the general rejoicing of an emancipated people. The writers of that day, sympathizing with the soldier, proclaimed their sentiments in pamphlets, sermons, orations, narratives, memoirs, histories, which furnished materials to subsequent writers for an endless succession of martial books. In the war of 1812, prosecuted for the defense of "free trade and sailors' rights," when our navy won victories on sea and lake, and our chivalry renown behind logs and cotton bags, and our invincible columns marched up to Canada and then marched back agin,—the Browns, the Jacksons, the Woods, the Wools, the Scots, the Ripleys, the Pikes, the Perrys, the Hulls, the Macdonoughs, the Decaturs, lived in countless volumes of heroic story, to mark the time of their achievements by the warlike tone of our literature. The "Peninsular campaign," or the conquest of some live Indians, of the Seminole tribe,

\* Washington and his Generals, by J. T. Headley. Baker & Scribner, New York.

by American troops, fighting side by side with the blood-hounds of Cuba, winning laurels with these illustrious "dogs of war" in the swamps of Florida, produced books on the military art, and the best methods of training blood-hounds; diaries, and letters of officers, biographies of distinguished generals, lives of Indian chiefs, &c.; indicating the taste of the people, and their progress in letters, as well as in arms. We now come to the last and most renowned campaign, which crowns its authors with more glory than the killing of Tecumseh, or the trapping of Oceola. This republic, cramped within the narrow limits of nine hundred thousand square miles, determined to stretch herself a little, particularly her southern limb, for the enlargement of the "area of freedom." This movement arousing a jealous neighbor to the protection of her territorial rights, led to a serious misunderstanding between the two nations and to a declaration of war. Our troops are ordered to cross the Nueces—Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma become famous battle fields. Soon our cannon are pointed across the Rio Grande—Matamoras, Camargo, Monterey and Saltillo yield to our arms—the sanguined field of Buena Vista tells of unparalleled feats of bravery. The renowned Scott, "the hero of Lundy's Lane," vied with the invincible Taylor, "the hero of Okiechobee," in martial exploits. Vera Cruz was captured, the strong fortress of San Juan de Ulloa could not withstand our bombshells. Our commander in chief, pausing in mid career of conquest, like a true knight of the temple, foremost in religious zeal as well as in valor, reverently entered a Popish cathedral, and in his inimitable style, gracefully receiving between the extremities of his thumb and forefinger a burning taper, in the plenitude of that charity which spurns

sectarian bounds, bent at the shrine of the Virgin Mary. The embattled heights of Cerro Gordo could not resist the shock of our arms. Jalapa, Perote, Puebla, Contreras, Churubusco, Chapultepec, were speedily surrendered, and our triumphant soldiery have "reveled in the halls of the Montezumas." True, this war has cost us a hundred and fifty millions of dollars—more than thirty thousand human lives have been sacrificed—causing, throughout our land, a wail like that of Egypt for her first-born children—the manners, morals, sensibilities and principles of rulers and people have been corrupted, and the nation is condemned in the judgment of heaven for lust of conquest and military ambition. But our regulars and volunteers have proved the native valor of the Anglo-Saxon race—that one of this stock is a match for five Mexicans behind intrenchments—Mexico has been taught the striking lesson that if we want any of her land we will have it—if she owes us any thing she shall pay in provinces, as well as in the blood of her citizens. Presidential candidates have been provided for the next twenty years—and a trophy of the conquest, the cork leg of Santa Anna, has been set up in our national museum. But the conquest of Mexico is not the only achievement of these days of glory—book-makers, catching the spirit that is abroad, have multiplied their productions and supplied, in profusion, books for the times. "Grim visaged" warriors in gilded frames frown upon us in print shops, parlors and public places. The periodical press records the most remarkable incidents in the lives of American generals; and a merchant's clerk, or printer's journeyman, turned out of employment for dishonesty and debauchery, and obliged to go as far towards the seat of war as Texas, figures in half a column of newspaper, as the gal-

lant Capt. A. or Lieut. B. ~~of~~ the — regiment. A list of "popular books for sale" runs something in this way—Napoleon and his Marshals—Life and Campaigns of Napoleon—Washington and the Generals of the Revolution, (Cary & Hart); Washington and his Generals, by Headly—Washington and his Generals, by Lippard—Taylor and his Generals—Polk and his Generals—Life of Santa Anna—Life of Ringgold—Life of Gen. Putnam—Life of Marion—Life of Jackson—Incidents of the Revolution—Book of the Army—Book of the Navy—The War of Independence—Knights of Malta—Life of Zachary Taylor—Indian Wars, including the discussion of the question, who killed Tecumseh? The pains taken by authors of books of this description, to celebrate war and warriors, is the effect of that false opinion of military greatness which has so long enthralled the human mind. If warriors have generally held the first place in the esteem of the world, it is not surprising that history, poetry and fiction have combined to glorify and enshrine the man who has commanded an army, or taken a city. We intend, however, in some of the following remarks, to question the claim of military heroes to such peculiar honor, and to show what place they should occupy among those who have acted a conspicuous part in human affairs.

"It is hard, to be sure," says John Foster, "very hard, that what has been bedizened by the most magnificent epithets of every language, what has procured for so many men the idolatry of the world, what has crowned them with royal, imperial, and according to the usual slang on the subject, immortal honors, what has obtained their apotheosis in history and poetry, it is hard and vexatious that this same adored maker of emperors and demi-gods should be reducible in literal truth of description to the occupation of

slaying men, and should therefore hold its honors at the mercy of the first gleam of sober sense that shall break upon mankind."

In the first place, we hold that military leaders, even the greatest of them, are not so preëminently great as their eulogists seem to suppose. Their intellectual endowments are not of the highest order. We do not mean that rare warlike talents are never combined with first rate powers of mind, but, that from the nature of the case, the highest abilities can never be developed either on the field of battle, or in arranging the complicated machinery of human slaughter.

It is affirmed by Martial Saxe, that "the most indispensable qualification of a great commander is valor, without which all others must prove nugatory." This language may mean that a general must be bold in the execution of his plans, fearless and self-possessed in the midst of danger, ready to face death at the cannon's mouth if it is necessary to complete "a turning manœuvre," or to restore order to his wavering troops. Although valor, in this sense, is something more than brutal courage, which hurries men to destruction without reflection, or regard to consequences; it can scarcely claim admiration as a remarkable endowment, since the comprehension of a few facts, and firmness of purpose, will enable a general to lead his columns into action in gallant style, and to ride for a whole day in front of his line on a "milk-white charger," while bullets are whizzing about his ears, and cannon balls falling around him every moment. It often exists in perfection in those who show little capacity for knowledge, or talent for intellectual pursuits. There have been great conquerors who seemed incapable of understanding the simplest principles of science, or of the conduct of public affairs. Dull on all subjects but those of the camp

and the battle-field—their scope of thought scarcely reached beyond the range of their cannon. Nor is valor an uncommon quality. Under different names, it belongs to masses of men. It is a characteristic of whole nations. A coward, in the ranks of an army, with the eyes of his comrades upon him, is a curiosity, and when in such circumstances, one soldier will turn from a line of presented bayonets, a hundred soldiers will rush upon it. If valor is the crowning excellence of a general, his “indispensable qualification,” he can not claim the homage of the world for his intellectual greatness, though he is as valiant as was Alexander, or Publius Horatius, the one-eyed hero, who saved Rome on one occasion by withstanding a whole army.

The application of “grand tactics,” is considered to be an exhibition of great powers. Of the elementary part of this art, including the principles of “right about face,” and “forward march,” and the formation and evolutions of companies, battalions and divisions, it is not necessary to speak. To form an army in the order of battle, and to bring it into action, are more complicated parts of the same business. The best positions for offense and defense are to be chosen; masses of troops are to be arranged according to the relative strength of the opposing forces; different modes of attack or protection are to be employed, as the nature of the field and the exigency of the occasion may demand; feints are to be made, surprises defeated; and the whole force of infantry, artillery and cavalry, brought to bear upon the enemy with the greatest effect. These operations, conducted in the best manner, require skill, sagacity, penetration, judgment—“a quick eye, a ready conception, a prompt execution.” Writers speak of the transcendent display of genius in scenes of war—of “prophetic vision,”

“sublime conceptions,” “profound philosophy,” exhibited in dispositions and manœuvres: but when they come to particularize, the climax ends in terms of less lofty import;—such as, “sound understanding with some genius,” “prompt and vigorous resources;”—“to accomplish all the purposes of war the judgment must be clear, the mind collected, the heart firm, the eye incapable of being diverted;” “all offensive and defensive operations in the field require mobility, solidity, impulsion, and the greatest possible amount of fire.” But, whether an army is drawn up in simple or complex form, in “parallel order,” or “parallel order with a crotchet,” whether the enemy’s array is pierced, or turned, or the attack made in column, or in line; on one, or on both wings,—however great the “mobility, solidity, impulsion and amount of fire,” there is no exhibition of those powers and qualities which we shall presently speak of as belonging to the highest order of intellectual greatness. The greatest display of what is called military genius lies in the conception and execution of an extensive campaign, like some “master stroke” of Frederic or Napoleon.

To form a plan of this kind, which, embracing half a continent, is to be carried out in the face of gigantic obstacles of nature and art; to direct the march of large masses of troops, with all their material, by different routes to a prescribed position, so as to concentrate the several divisions of a grand army, with such exactness that they shall arrive at the hour appointed for striking a decisive blow; to anticipate the designs of an enemy, and to forestall his movements so as to meet him at a vital point with a superior force,—requires the action of no ordinary mind. It demands uncommon capacity, invention of expedients, comprehension of details, knowledge of physical science, clear discernment

of probable events, sound judgment and power of combination, but not the exercise of the highest intellectual powers, such for example, as are seen in the discoveries of science, the abstractions of mental philosophy, and the creations of poetry.

We shall not attempt to prove this assertion by regular steps, but the common sense of mankind will judge correctly in the case, if it is not dazzled by visions of martial glory. Some achievements of the mind we place instinctively among its noblest efforts. Some things in nature inspire at sight the emotion of the sublime. Without argumentation, we say that the cataract of Niagara is a grand object; not only so, but that it exceeds, on account of its grandeur, an ordinary waterfall. We may of course compare things more unlike in their nature, yet having common qualities, and say, that poetry surpasses painting in its effects upon the imagination. By a kind of intuitive judgment of this sort, we say that an epic poem transcends the plan of a great campaign, and requires the action of a greater mind. They bear a certain resemblance to each other; some of the same powers, though in an unequal degree, are employed in both—some of the processes of thought and secondary results are the same—both, abstractly considered, excite admiration; but the judgment which is formed of their comparative greatness, is in favor of the poem. Take one of the greatest military operations in the annals of war, the campaign of Napoleon in Germany in 1805. Draw it out in form, and consider the ability displayed in its consummate manœuvres. With what forethought this master of the art of war, foiled on the shores of the British Channel in his attempt upon England, conceived the idea of making the failure of his darling scheme a cover to his designs in the heart of the continent; with what invention, comprehension, judgment

and knowledge, he moved the several corps of his grand army, of two hundred thousand men, from different stations, to occupy certain positions with the precision and speed of a troop of cavalry; with what skill, penetration, and combination of scientific rules, he disposed of these forces, so as to capture one army, paralyze another, defeat a third, and by these manœuvres, to gain the advantage of dictating his own terms of peace in the Austrian capital.

Take now Milton's *Paradise Lost*—consider its plan, its scope, its theme, embracing “things unattempted yet, in prose or rhyme,” the melody of its numbers, the sublimity of its style, its wonderful creations, its heaven of truth, its depth of learning, its philosophy “to the height of this great argument,” to “justify the ways of God to men”—all indicating the power and range of a mind capable of unrivaled efforts in any sphere of thought; and tell us which is the noblest work of genius, which the production of the greatest mind? In reasoning about the impressions and opinions caused by a comparison of this sort, one would say, I see in the first, only arrangements for surmounting physical obstacles, for moving one mass of human beings upon another mass of human beings, by means of the various appliances of war, so as to accumulate at eligible points the greatest possible number of men and guns. These operations require, indeed, the action of a mind “fertile in expedients, prompt in its decisions, and sound in its judgments;” but I do not perceive that the employment of physical force to overcome physical force, so as to fulfill in the highest degree the conditions of that art which was defined by Napoleon to be “the art of dividing one's self to subsist, and of multiplying one's self to fight,” however complicated the machinery by which this force is moved, or however ex-

to seize the field of its conquests, requires the exercise of some of the highest intellectual faculties, as imagination, taste, creative genius, or the profoundest action of the reasoning powers; such as distinguish the poem, and the productions of the first class of orators, statesmen, philosophers, artists and men of letters.

The difference then between a great poet and a great general, is a difference in the kind as well as the degree of mental power. One exhibits greater capacity, finer faculties, deeper research and nobler conceptions, than the other. The genius of the warrior is concerned with gross forms of matter; that of the poet acts upon the immortal mind. The one is tangible and circumscribed, the other is subtle and boundless; one traces its way with uncertain steps, the other with assurance; one reaches its results by calculation, the other by intuition; one combines, shapes, invents, the other creates and brings to view new truths and new forms of truth; one is an earthly endowment, the other "the vision and the faculty divine!" One is blasted by the frost of a single night, or buried in the snows of a Russian winter—the other endures forever.

To accomplish all the objects of ordinary campaigns, no great talents are required; only those who have been inventors in military science, or have so far improved the inventions of others as to claim equal honor, come near enough, in an intellectual point of view, to men of real genius, to deserve a comparison with them. In general, it is only necessary for commanders-in-chief, field marshals and officers of inferior grades, to follow approved rules, or obey instructions, making some allowance for accidents, in order to arrive at distinction in the sublime art which consists in "mobility, solidity, impulsion and the greatest possible amount of fire." Its prac-

tice, so fettered by rules, necessarily requires only a scanty stock of ideas and a limited range of thought. To acquire its scientific principles may expand and sharpen the mind, as much as to master the rules of any art or profession; but to apply these principles under the instructions of military discipline, does not admit of the same degree of inquiry and progress as other vocations of a corresponding rank.

The profession of arms, therefore, can not claim the respect due to any of the learned professions, because these allow of independent thinking and acting, and of variety and range in the subjects of pursuit and contemplation. "Is the military character," inquires Dymond, "distinguished by intellectual eminence? —is it not distinguished by intellectual inferiority? I speak of course of the exercise of intellect. I believe if we look around, we shall find that no class of men, in a parallel rank in society, exercise it less, or less honorably to human nature, than the military profession." If to acquire distinction in this vocation demands uncommon abilities, it can hardly be accounted for, that celebrated warriors have been so abundant, in all ages of the world and among all nations. They have come up in troops upon the stage of life, to occupy the space cleared for them by violent revolutions, or to cut their own way with the sword. They have come too, like Minerva, in full growth and panoply. While ancient history celebrates a few orators, poets, philosophers and artists, its pages are studded with the shining names of generals and conquerors. The same is true of all history. Among remote tribes having scarcely a gleam of intelligence to attract attention, there have sprung up mighty chieftains claiming a share of the common fund of glory. Every considerable war produces famous warriors to order, and the supply is always greater than

the demand. They come from the plough, the shop, the counting-house, as well as from military schools. On every suspension of arms, marr'd and scarred they seek their homes, to excite "pitying tears" and to receive the choicest honors of the brave. But though it is true that great emergencies produce great men, and that some, without any regular training, work their way to posts of high renown, they do not thus come in crowds, nor reach maturity in a night. They stand "like a few light-houses along a thousand miles of coast," and not as thick as markers in a regiment.

If then men are to be judged of and applauded, according to their comparative intellectual greatness, we can not account for the distinction conferred upon military heroes by the acclamations of the multitude, and by those who record their exploits.

The same difficulty occurs, when we come to consider the effect of their achievements upon the common interests of mankind. It is easy to point to acts of individual prowess in behalf of the suffering victims of oppression or calamity—to life preserved, to liberty restored, by the gallantry of ancient and modern heroes. By armies and battle ships, a nation has maintained, for a season, her independence. A check has been given to the incursions of predatory hordes; an oppressed people have arisen in their might, and cast off the rule of a tyrant; civilization has been carried into the midst of barbarism, and the contact of two belligerent powers has opened to both new channels of wealth and knowledge. Though advantages like these have in a few instances been gained; when all the bloodshed and desolation which war has produced, together with its effects, present and to come, upon the morals of nations and of individuals, are taken into view, even in these cases how much

have its benefits exceeded its evils? It is to be considered, besides, that in most of these cases, the advantages might have been secured by peaceful means. It is often said that the invasion of Mexico by our armies, will there result in important political changes, and the triumphs of pure Christianity. Says a southern divine, speaking of this war, "every soldier will be a colporteur, and every cannon-ball a tract." One would think that a few millions of dollars well laid out, might have prepared a broader highway for the progress of the true Gospel in that country, than the military road opened by our troops. Major General Winfield Scott, of the regular apostolic church, and Captain Vinton, of the same communion, who fell while fitting himself for the holy order of deacons, in the trenches before Vera Cruz, at the head of twenty thousand devoted followers, making their way by prayers and alms-deeds, sustained by the vigorous measures of government, would have done more for the evangelization of poor bleeding Mexico, than Captain Walker's Texan colporteurs, or Captain Bragg's tracts. That a few instances, however, have occurred in which, all things considered, the effects of war have been apparently beneficial to society, and in which these advantages could not have been secured without a resort to arms, we are willing to admit. But apart from particular cases, what is to be said of war in general, of the "aid and comfort" that it bestows upon the human race? It is conceded by the most reasonable advocates of the necessity of keeping alive a military spirit, that wars of ambition, undertaken for national glory and aggrandizement, wars of retaliation or revenge, predatory wars, wars of conquest, wars of propagandism, are unjust wars, or as one of them affirms, "murder on a large scale." How much then of armed violence, of strife, and mor-

tal struggle of furious combatants, may be put under the comprehensive title of murder on a large scale. What blessings, on the whole, in return for these evils, have warriors brought into the common fund of human happiness? Where, in universal history, we find an empire has been founded by them in one age, it has been destroyed in another—where civil liberty has been established once, it has been overthrown many times—where the arm of one oppressor has been broken, the arms of a thousand oppressors have been strengthened—where the life of one human being has been saved, a hundred thousand lives have been sacrificed. If the visible sway of Christianity has ever been extended by the sword, it has often lost its power. If it has been the means of turning any to righteousness, how many has it sent, without a warning, and with curses on their lips, to the world of retribution!

True, warriors have done some good; the convulsions which they have made the world pass through in tearful agony for its best blood and choicest treasures, have brought forth some changes, some improvements; their march has not been all woe, all desolation. Some green things have sprung up among the ruins they have left—some useful changes have followed their foot-steps; so does a serene sky follow storms—a healthful breeze, the sirocco—population the track of the pestilence, and sculpture flourishes in grave yards. They have indeed added to the triumphs of art, but their monuments are tombs and their great works cities of the dead. Have these men then, done enough good, to be classed among the benefactors of their race,—among those who, discerning the great principles of truth, and solving the difficult problems of their application to human conduct and to the productions of genius, have enlarged the realm of

thought and multiplied the means of happiness, or among men of moral sublimity, who, feeling no dishonor like that of sin, and feeling that “like a wound,” have struggled hard in a good cause, and set enduring examples of patience and suffering for conscience sake. Why should not these men have the triumphs and wreaths, reserved for the successful warrior? Why should he personify greatness? Has he fairly earned his “apotheosis in history and poetry?” Is not his profession “reducible, in literal truth of description, to the occupation of slaying men, holding its honors at the mercy of the first gleam of sober sense which shall break upon mankind?”

Entertaining these views of martial heroes, we are displeased with those books which represent Washington as chiefly distinguished for his military talents. Among the great men of modern times, he holds the first place. His high rank is his award by the consent of the friends and the enemies of that independence which he won and established by his achievements in the field and his counsels in the cabinet. It is the tribute of an admiring world to the preëminence of the man, whom, in the fondness of our affection, we call the Father of his country, and who is known abroad as the great American. The times in which he lived, the nature of the contest in which he was engaged, the conspicuous field of its display, and the successful issue of that contest, have undoubtedly enhanced his fame. But no casual concurrence of events, no adulation of a grateful people, no admiration of military talents, can account for the fact that the world has departed from its usual estimate of greatness to do such peculiar honor to one not distinguished for what are called brilliant actions. The character of Washington has been so often ably drawn, that our brief remarks may seem a repetition of familiar thoughts; but our aim is rather to keep his

sample in view, than to present it in any new light. Sculptors, in chiseling the human form, do not copy any single specimen, since one faultless in every part, is not to be found in nature; but by selecting from a number of individuals, by imitating the head of one, the hand of another, and the foot of a third, the ideal of a Michael Angelo or a Canova, is realized. Since man came out of Eden, deformed by sin, it is by selection that a perfect character is delineated. But if we were to point to an individual combining the greatest number of model-traits, it would be to Washington. In him physical and mental power are seen in true proportion—strong intellect with fine sensibility—high moral principle equal to the control of impetuous passions, valor and consummate prudence, imagination tempered so as to allow of the clearest decisions of the reasoning powers—profound judgment—great firmness and great forbearance—untiring zeal and great moderation—self-esteem with supreme reverence for God—unequalled disinterestedness, deliberation in counsel—promptness in action. He was a 'soldier without cruelty—a statesman without selfishness—a patriot without ambition—seeking, in all his actions, the approval of his conscience, rather than applause or emolument. He appears in time of war to save his country from foreign dominion, and in time of peace, to protect the growth of a young nation by a wise administration of its affairs, and closes his official life by a renunciation of its honors, and spends his last days in preparing for the enjoyments of that world, which his Christian faith taught him to regard above earthly rewards. No act of his life as well illustrates so many points of character, as the position he assumed in view of the threatening aspect of our foreign relations at one period of the French Revolution. Here are seen his clear foresight of coming events—the

deep political sagacity which devised means of relief without provoking to the last extremity the enemies of the government and the abettors of war—the skill which carefully adjusted the conflicting claims of England, France and Spain—the courage which withstood the clamors of faction, the arms of rebellion, and "the bravadoes of the Republican envoy"—and the stern regard for principle alone, which, encountering the hatred and defamation of his countrymen, risked an unrivaled reputation for the defense of right and the blessings of peace. At a most important juncture, of a most critical period, how grandly does this man appear, in his communication to the Senate of the United States containing these memorable words—"but as peace ought to be preserved with unremitting zeal, before the last resource, which has so often been the scourge of nations, and can not fail to check the advancing prosperity of the United States, is contemplated, I have thought proper to nominate, and do hereby nominate, John Jay as Envoy Extraordinary of the United States to his Britannic Majesty." The rare combination of qualities in the character of Washington, is one reason why many persons who profess to admire his moral excellence underrate his genius. The powers of his understanding were in such harmony with each other and with his affections and moral faculties, that they do not appear in their real eminence without examination. Nothing is prominent where every thing is pleasing through symmetry. An edifice of the finest proportions is not at the first glance so striking an object, as one in which some defect, sets off the finer parts by contrast.

It requires attention to appreciate the Parthenon, while the singular beauty of an antique column or portico, in some rude specimen of architecture, strikes us at once. If

Washington had lacked some of the qualities of greatness, he would have appeared to ordinary minds as a more brilliant genius—like some of his compatriots whose faults showed off their excellences, or like some of those who in all ages of the world have excited admiration by dazzling strokes of war, dashing experiments in civil government, or splendid eccentricities. The untaught mind that, discerning the conservative principles of order and happiness, could apply them in the best manner to the objects of free legislation and executive control, and preside over the formation of a new government on an untried field, and prove its vitality, and test its strength, by conducting it safely through the severest trials, must have been a great mind. “To adjust, in the best compromise, a thousand interfering views, so as to effect the greatest good of the whole with the least inconvenience to the parts; to curb the dragon of faction by means which insure the safety of public liberty; to marshal opinion and prejudice among the auxiliaries of the law; in fine, to touch the mainspring of national agency, so as to preserve the equipoise of its powers, and to make the feeblest movements of the extremities accord with the impulse at the center,—is only for genius of the highest order.” Thus the hero sinks before the statesman, the science of war yields to the science of government, and the moral sublimity of good actions transcends the pomp of military exploits.

In this view of the character of Washington, his military talents appear in their proper place,—thrown into the shade of rarer and more excellent endowments. That he possessed the ability of the first order of generals, is proved by his conduct of the Revolutionary war, as well as by particular instances of skill, such as his operation after the action of Princeton, which is considered by critics one of the best of

the kind on record. Though not exactly an inventor in warfare, he practised it so successfully, on a difficult and untried field, as to merit the honor of invention. On the theater of Europe, at the head of the disciplined armies of France, he might have gained some of her most celebrated victories. If, indeed, to plan and manage campaigns in all circumstances, so as to secure the greatest possible success, constitutes the ablest general, Washington was superior to Napoleon. Washington might not have attempted some of his master-strokes, but in a long and tedious campaign, or in a series of campaigns, extending through many years, he would have gained more real advantage than the “great Captain,” through his superior prudence and judgment, which were never perverted by the ardor of desire. He never would have plunged into the disasters of the Russian expedition, which was not only a political error, but a grand military blunder, conceived in a false estimate of the chances of war, and of what men and guns can do against the most formidable obstacles of nature and art, and carried on in brave neglect of some of the essential rules of warfare.

Though Washington was a warrior, he had the true view of real greatness, and of the creed commonly adopted by belligerent powers. “How pitiful,” says he, “in the eye of reason and religion, is that false ambition which desolates the world with fire and sword for the purposes of conquest and selfish ambition, compared to the milder virtue of making our neighbors and our fellow men as happy as their frail conditions and perishing natures will permit them to be.” He appears in a bloody revolution more like a savior than a hero, wielding a shield rather than a sword, as if sent, since the passions of men would stir them up to strife, and hurl them together in mortal combat, to check

their ferocity, to mitigate horrors which he could not prevent, and in the wisdom of a dear-bought experience, to utter a solemn protest against the motives and principles which commonly involve nations in war. In this, as in other respects, he seems so unlike other warriors, that he is hardly to be mentioned in the same category. We see in one, magnanimity, dauntless courage, irresistible energy, connected with rashness, ferocity, besetting vices, and an insatiable love of conquest which spurned the limits of the habitable globe. In another, we see love of country, and all the qualifications requisite in so great a commander, connected with cruelty and implacable revenge. In Napoleon, we see tremendous destructive power, ceaseless activity, inventive genius, with a devouring ambition, which desolated the world. "He was a conqueror—he was a tyrant." In all these we observe the warrior's passion predominant—that love of glory, which must be gratified at any expense of human life and happiness; but in Washington, the closest scrutiny can detect no such deformity, and the record of his achievements is without one stain.

A true view of this great man, therefore, is not given in a military sketch-book—with the portrait of Washington in regiments for a frontispiece—and whose interest depends upon the fancy of the writer in setting out, with effect, thrilling scenes and remarkable incidents, interspersed with allusions, carefully made, for the show of consistency, to such matters as "going to church" and wisely administering affairs of state, and to such traits as disinterestedness and self-control. His true history is one of moral changes and political events, affecting the interests of mankind,—of the start and and growth of a great nation protected by honesty and courage,—of truth and justice and all the virtues. In the narrative, his military career

of course comes in, but subordinate both in importance and interest. A writer who spends the force of his descriptive talents in exhibiting Washington as a hero of romance; who dwells so long on his martial air, that we forget the majesty of goodness, which surrounded him, and gives such a lustre to his sword, that we see not the charmed rod of a peaceful authority, by which his greatest achievements were accomplished,—does violence to history, and mars the example of the "Great American."

It seems to be taken for granted by a large class of writers, that every thing connected with our Revolution was of course right, and will bear endless repetition, in every variety of form and coloring. Is it perfectly clear, however, that this contest was delayed until all the expedients had been tried which Christian morality, (we do not say national morality, as expressed in custom and law,) required. Might not our cause have prevailed over the tyrannical measures of the British ministry and parliament, by peaceful opposition? What if the colonists, without the show of armed resistance, had said, and had continued to say, to the king of England, "We are your children, our rights are the rights of British subjects, and we are determined to maintain them by all lawful means." We will use none of your stamped paper—but we will not pull down the houses of the 'stamp officers,' and compel them to fly at midnight, with their wives and children, from an infuriated populace. We deny the right of Parliament to collect any revenue in these colonies without our consent, and will agree to 'non-importation and non-consumption,' and make any sacrifices which the exigency of the country demands; but we will not beat and bruise the officers of the customs, nor burn the ships of government. We protest against the quartering of troops in

Boston—but we will not provoke them by insult, nor assail them at their posts of duty, compelling them in defense of life to commit the ‘Boston massacre.’ We will use no tea—but we will not protect ‘Indians’ in destroying the tea of the East India Company. While we protest against the Boston port bill, we will not vote to enroll minute men, and ‘warn every man to prepare himself with a good fire-lock, ammunition, &c.’ To maintain these declarations, ‘we pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.’ With an American party in the House of Lords, an American party in the House of Commons, and a strong sympathy for us out of Parliament—with such orators to plead for us, as Camden, Chatham and Burke, Great Britain can not be forever deaf to our complaints, or mistaken as to her own interests. We entrust the success of our cause, to a bloodless, self-denying opposition.” Lest this suggestion which may seem rather quakerish, should be misunderstood, we repeat it in a little different form.

While it is conceded that there may be such a thing as an excusable war, and that a resort to arms might have been necessary, at a certain crisis of our colonial affairs; we say that many of the measures which brought on that crisis were not marked by the forbearance, the sacrifice of present good, the concessions, and every possible precaution, demanded by humanity and religion. The parliamentary debates, and indeed any impartial annals of the times, show that the rioting, the burning, the pillaging, the “tarring and feathering;” the insulting and wounding of the officers of the crown; the destruction of public and private property, by mobs, with the open approval, or secret connivance, of the mass of the people; the show of weapons, and the “resenting,” says a standard historian, “with equal indignation, the most trivial, as well as the most serious

attacks,”—all these things confirmed the British government in its system of oppression, and brought on the shock of arms. These measures, notwithstanding the petitioning and remonstrating of the colonists, exasperated the ministry, discouraged the friends of America in England, alienated more and more the inhabitants of the two countries, and prevented reconciliation, until the pride, nourished by the victories of a thousand years, of a haughty conqueror, being fully aroused, it was declared in Parliament that the “question was no longer one of taxation, but of the redress of wrongs, of reparation for deeds of outrage.” Hence, the passage of those odious laws, including the Boston port bill, after the destruction of tea in Boston harbor, and by such large majorities, comprising some who had warmly espoused the American cause. Hence the unanimity of the British people in favor of these measures. Says Botta, “these new laws were received in England with universal applause; as a general and violent indignation had been excited there, by the insolence and enormities of the Americans.” Dr. Franklin has given an explanation of the whole matter in a few words: “The preamble of the stamp act,” says he, “produced the tea-act—the tea-act produced violence—violence, acts of Parliament—acts of Parliament, revolt.” By a reliance, then, upon the justice of our cause, in the spirit of firm resistance, marked by no acts of violence, if we had not obtained what cost us a seven years war, we might at least, have gone into that war without stain or reproach, having done nothing to provoke it—having tried every expedient, and made every sacrifice, which Christianity demanded.

Besides, are we to forget the agency of the Supreme Being in human affairs? He was appealed to, in that contest, “to fight our battles for us;” might He not have been

retied upon to turn the heart of the king, as well as to pierce the shields of the mighty? His good Spirit, invoked to preside over the deliberations of hostile cabinets, might have accomplished as great a deliverance as the angel of death who smote the British host; and though neither chariots of fire, nor horses of fire, had appeared round about our encampment, one like unto the Son of God, might have been seen in the midst of the fiery furnace of trial.

What a beautiful page would now be opened in history had our independence been the pure concession of an arbitrary government to the principles of civil liberty and the rights of free citizens;—what an example to the nations then waking up to the importance of asserting these rights, and beginning to feel around the old foundations of privileged establishments.

By these remarks we mean not to disparage the men who bore the brunt of the Revolution. They loved liberty—they loved their country. We are not indifferent to their valor, or their fame. Our feelings are alive to the stirring scenes connected with their history. In view of Lexington and Bunker's Hill, our emotions are like those of every American. We are not royalists, nor tories, but New Englanders—“real Yankees.” We like, sometimes, to listen to an old soldier as he tells about that hard winter in Valley Forge, or how Washington looked as he rode up to some of his troops one morning with the intelligence that supplies for the army would reach the camp before night, and how it happened that he heard him praying one morning, in a retired place, that the Supreme Ruler of events would put an end to the horrors of war. But these men were not infallible. We may be allowed to question the soundness of some opinions, the expediency of some actions, deemed right and excellent in their day. The world has rolled

round many times since '76. As we live in the midst of clearer illuminations of truth, and farther on towards the consummation of things, we may take higher ground on all subjects which concern the improvement and happiness of our race. Yet allowing all that can be claimed for the heroes of the revolution, what good is done by these fanciful exhibitions of their exploits, ten thousand times repeated, with only some slight variations of perspective and scenery? What object of mental improvement, what useful art, what knowledge, what virtue, is to be secured by “illustrating the battles of the revolution,” which a popular author informs us was his “great labor,” in writing a book of seven hundred pages, in which such a desperado as Paul Jones is held up for admiration by the side of George Washington, and mere bravery is the charm of its heroes. Such representations serve only to exalt warriors and excite martial ardor. And whatever may be said of the revolution, such a war is not likely to occur again in all time; and this excitement, kept alive as a reserved force for the great emergencies of our republic, must find vent in some such way as the invasion of Mexico, or spend itself in fantastic parades. If the last were the only evil to be apprehended from the heroic literature of the day, we would keep silence, content with what is gained in the department of letters by fancy sketching and poetic description; but in view of greater evils we complain, and we intend to complain, of those book-makers who from desire of fame, or love of money, or wrong notions as to the tendency of their writings, send forth captivating descriptions of scenes of carnage, whether they are drawn from the battle grounds of America, or the charnel fields of the French Revolution.

War is a dreadful evil—war, in its mildest form, is a dreadful evil.

Let it be described truthfully, so as to excite aversion instead of pleasure and applause, and the same dread as the ravages of disease, or a stroke of the pestilence. A band of painted savages at the sound of the war-whoop, rushing upon their enemies, is war,—war in its true colors, in black and red paint, and not in blue and buff—war without the usual accompaniments of star-spangled banners, splendid uniforms, brass bands, and the consequent effusions of romancers and balled-mongers. The flash of a scalping knife before the eye of a dying victim, and the loss of the scalp-lock, make but little difference with the thing itself. Is this more dreadful than some of the modes of killing practised by civilized nations—for example, than the exploits of the Texan Rangers in Mexican villages, or the sending of hot shot, bombs, and every sort of deadly projectile, into the midst of a populous city, wounding, crushing and killing men, women and children, for the mere purpose of “striking terror into its inhabitants.” Make some of the surviving sufferers of Atlixco poets and historians, instead of Campbell and Col. Stone, and we would have descriptions of scenes as dreadful as those of Wyoming and Cherry Valley. To represent a combat between two regiments in the style of some writers—to call a fight, in which with blood-shot eyes, blanched cheeks and lips quivering with deadly passion, they rush together armed with long knives and loaded guns pointed with daggers, and after firing at each other’s hearts, cut, hack and stab, until half of their number lie gasping in the agonies of death—to call this “a splendid affair,” “a brilliant action,” “a glorious engagement,”—to say, as one of our generals, commanding in Mexico, said in his despatches, after giving an account of the storming of Chapultepec, in which a thousand men were laid in their blood on the

slopes of that fortress, “no sight could be more animating or glorious,”—seems to us, not only an abuse of language, but in this age of the world, unpardonable inhumanity.

There is coming a better time than '76 or '48—when, cherished opinions yielding to Christianity the full control of human conduct, the differences between nations and individuals will not be settled by mortal combat, and men in the refinement and fellowship of the age of peace will be astonished at the barbarity of our times, at the pretexts assigned for acts of outrage and aggression, at our armaments and military engines, our howitzers, paixhans and “peace-makers,” our percussion guns, revolvers, and bowie-knives, and the whole family of deadly projectiles. But the greatest wonder will be, as they turn over relics of these curious things, in museums and antiquarian halls, by what contrivance they were made to prevent the effusion of blood, and to “conquer a peace.” Notwithstanding the gloomy aspect of some passing events, especially in our own country, where we are to look for the first signs and the first fruits of this auspicious period; there are some signs, and some sure words of prophecy, which foreshow its coming. Every lover of humanity, even if he regards not the highest happiness of man as a renewed and holy being, but simply the abatement of a dreadful scourge on the earth, hails the approach of such a day. Can authors then too soon begin to write in view of it,—to see that no false sentiment, no poetic coloring, shall weaken the natural impressions of actual war? And can those who give the first lessons of morality to the young, too carefully shield them from the influence of those books which, keeping before their minds the visionary splendors of martial life, lead them to covet distinction in arms, rather than in the

pursuits of learning and the arts of peace? The Spartan mother sent forth her son to battle, giving him his shield, and saying—"Go, my son, return with this, or upon it." The Christian mother should teach her son another lesson: "If thine enemy hunger, feed him, if he thirst, give him drink." This seems to accord with the sentiments of Washington, as appears from the following incident. While on a journey to the frontier settlements of New-York, soon after the close of the revolutionary war, he stopped for a night in the valley of the Mohawk, at the house of a lady whose husband had fallen in battle. She introduced her two sons to the General, with the remark, "I have devoted these sons to fight the battles of their country." "I hope, madam," replied Washington, "you will train them for a better service; I have seen enough of war."

We intend to make particular allusion to only one of the books whose titles are prefixed to our article, viz., *Washington and his Generals*, by Headley. Having before, in a review of '*Napoleon and his Marshals*,' expressed pretty freely our opinion of Mr. Headley as a martial biographer, we consider it unnecessary to say much of this work, which is marked by the same characteristics as its predecessor. There are in both the same indications of hasty and careless composition, the same dashing style, the same profusion of jumbled metaphors, crude expressions, and unfinished sentences, the same disregard of sense and syntax, the same mock-heroic sentiments and rash assertions, about the same number of earthquakes and thunderbolts, with a sprinkling of avalanches, and the same signs of the author's fondness for battle scenes, and of his admiration of warriors.

"*Washington and his Generals*," however, is if possible, more loosely written than the other, while it lacks

its vigor and freshness; and its rapid passage through a number of editions is owing more to its subject and the popularity of its predecessor, than to any merit of the work. Its apparent inferiority in point of composition may arise in part from the fact, that Mr. Headley's peculiar style is not remarkable for those qualities which wear well. The secret of this he has inadvertently revealed in his preface. In alluding to the charge of repetition, he says,—"The intense words of our language are soon exhausted, and one is often compelled, in describing thrilling scenes, to choose between a weak sentence and the repetition of strong words and perhaps similar comparisons."

Here lies the capital mistake of this writer. He tries to be intense, but not in the right way. A thrilling scene is to be described: his mind falters between two extremes, and it being absolutely necessary that a thrill should be produced, it decides in favor of the intense words, and now they come down upon the reader "like an avalanche;" as if beauty, or pathos, or sublimity, in writing, depended upon strong words and startling comparisons, and not upon clear conceptions expressed in natural language, and the indescribable touch of genius given to the whole scene. It is like the mistake of the painter who wishing to produce a striking portrait, makes every feature as prominent as he can, and loses the likeness, which depends not on a Roman nose, nor a Grecian forehead, but upon the expression, which comes from a mysterious combination of all the features, and which the talent of the real artist can alone impart. Mr. Headley's repugnance to weak sentences is probably the reason why we have such strong ones as the following:—"With all his strong passions bursting, and nothing but themselves to burst upon, he became a prey to these self-lashings

which furnish the climax of rage." "The water was charmed into foam by the raising balls." "Those shattered veterans then swung, rent asunder, and rolled heavily to their camp." "The smoke refused to lift in the damp air." "The silent redoubt suddenly again gaped and shot forth fire like some huge monster." This constant effort to produce effect by the use of emphatic words and startling comparisons, running out sometimes into rant and nonsense, offends the reader's taste and presents so often the same images to the mind that they become tame and wearisome. If, frequently in the course of a chapter, and sometimes twice on a page, a charge of troops or a stroke of a broadsword is compared to a 'thunderbolt'—thunderbolts become as common as any sort of bolts and make no more impression, and thus tameness, the very evil shunned by the writer, comes round at last. For our own part, we prefer a weak sentence now and then, to so many strong ones "bursting and nothing but themselves to burst upon." The fault alluded to belongs not only to our author's descriptions of scenes, but to his delineations of character. The impressions which his sketches make upon the reader are at best vague and unsatisfactory on account of much confusion in the plan and conduct of the narrative, and a want of connection between the several parts. We observe, for example, at the top of a page, such a topic as "His influence over others"—but in looking through the remarks under this head we find observations upon changes in a man's style of writing, or some anecdote illustrative of patriotism or magnanimity, which, by no art of construction, can be made to relate to "his influence over others." We find asserted on one page, what is denied on another, so that we are often unable to gain a distinct idea of the men brought before us or of

the author's opinions of his own heroes. This impression however is very distinct, that there were giants in those days, and that they performed many wonderful exploits, but their individuality is lost in their greatness. The truth is, Mr. Headley is not a writer of lives. He has a talent for describing some scenes with much vividness and effect, but not for drawing characters. He repeats a great many facts, makes many sensible observations, and gives some characteristic touches; he forms a gilded frame for a portrait; he sketches, he paints, he bedizens,—but he does not portray. His volumes therefore are sketch-books—fancy pieces: they give us the scenes of the Revolution, but not the men of the Revolution.

As public observers and informers of the moral tendencies of popular books, besides expressing our own views of the subject of this work, and protesting against such delineations as are fitted to foster the war-spirit, we feel bound to notice certain dangerous statements inculcated here and there in its pages. We do not accuse its author of intending to teach anything contrary to sound morality. But, either through a propensity to say strong things in a strong way, or his absorbing admiration of military chiefs, he, at times, confounds all distinctions of right and wrong. We particularly refer to his manner of estimating character, by striking a balance between a man's good and bad qualities. He says, in speaking of General Lee, "The lamb can not become the lion, nor the lion the lamb, by any sort of cultivation. Therefore such a person is not to be judged by the extent and frequency with which he passes the line of right." "His noble generosity, magnanimous self-devotion to the welfare of others, his hatred of oppression and scorn of meanness, are to be placed against his bursts of passion, sudden revenge,

and these faults which are committed in moments of excitement. Of Paul Jones—"he was an irregular character, but his good qualities predominated over his bad ones." Of Arnold—"several stories are related of him to prove that he was dishonorable, many of which are doubtless true—but there is one in his favor outweighing them all in my estimation;" "this noble and generous act offsets a thousand accusations of meanness." Again he says of General Lee—"one ought always to average such a character as that of Lee, and let the good balance the bad." Now let us look at our author's own account of this man. "His hatred was intense and unsparing, and where it fell every green thing withered. The hostility he exhibited towards Washington, to the day of his death, is the only instance in his life when he seemed to be governed long by a revengeful feeling." "With all his strong passions bursting, and nothing but themselves to burst upon, he became a prey to those self-lashings which furnish the climax of rage." "It was this which fed and kindled into tenfold intensity, his wrath"—"he sprinkled even his letters with profanity"—"his vanity, ambition and self-confidence were enormous, his morals were as bad as his manners—he was terribly profane, and always followed the bent of his own passions." "His religious sentiments may be gathered from his will. After bequeathing his soul to the Almighty, he declares that he

thinks a man's religious notions are of no consequence—adding, a weak mortal can be no more answerable for his persuasive notions, or even skepticism in religion, than for the color of his skin. . . . I desire most earnestly that I may not be buried in any church, or church-yard, or within a mile of any Presbyterian or Anabaptist meeting-house; for since I have resided in this country, I have kept so much bad company when living, that I do not choose to continue it when dead." This is the character "one ought always to average and let the good balance the bad." It strikes us that such a rule of judgment confounds all moral distinctions, overlooks the ruling principle of conduct, and lessens our detestation of the most depraved characters. Every human being has good impulses, and does some things that accord with the rules of mere morality. Benedict Arnold committed treason but once, which, according to this philosophy, may be neutralized by a hundred acts of bravery and munificence. We could multiply examples, if they were necessary, to show that such a rule applied to character, as in the work before us, is most pernicious.

Of the historical inaccuracies in these narratives we shall say nothing, since our limits will not allow us to go into the necessary references and details, and other journals have already, to some extent, discharged that duty.

## REVIEW OF DR. SPRING'S "POWER OF THE PULPIT."\*

"It is the *worst of all trades*," said John Newton, of the Christian ministry, "but the *best of all professions*;" and a truer remark never fell from the lips of that eminently wise and pious man.

Let any one go to it as a *trade*, whether the *gain* sought be honor, influence, competence or comfort, and it will prove to him in its *progress*, and infinitely more in its *end*, "the *worst of all trades*." On the other hand, let any one enter it with right views and feelings, in the spirit of labor and self-sacrifice, to honor God and do good to men, and no matter what toils and privations may attend it, he will find it "the *best of all professions*;" the best in its discipline to his own mind and heart; the best, alike, in its restraining and reforming power; the best in all its influences, social, civil and moral, on nations and individuals, for time and eternity. Even if assailed by obloquy, opposition, or persecution, its progress, like that of the Son of God on earth, will be attended by light and blessing, and its end, like his, be the fullness of joy and glory.

"*Best*" as it is, however, it is not beyond improvement; for, as with every profession, its improvement is that of those who are in it; and every effort to improve them should be welcomed with respectful favor. True, it is a difficult, and too often a thankless office to give advice, though the man that suggests wise counsels, sustained and enforced by strong reasons, is the benefactor of his race. But when it comes from one whose position gives it weight,

and is the result of his own experience, and is so embodied in the form of discussion, as to find *easy*, because *indirect* access to those for whom it was designed, then it may be expected to issue in great and lasting good.

Such good we expect from the work before us. Its author, subject, form, the classes it addresses, and its mode of address, are all such as to give it claims upon our notice, and interest in our hope. From few, if any in the land, could it have emanated with the same propriety as from Dr. Spring. His experience has been various, and his ministry long continued and richly blessed. He has not made it his business to amuse or alarm the community, by every now and then exploding theories, which if novel, are questionable, or if manifestly original, are as manifestly irrational and false. He has not been the lion of "anniversary" platforms, or famed as the popular lecturer, nor often appeared in the pages of periodicals and reviews. A higher and nobler praise is his due. He has stood, for a lifetime, at his one post of toil and duty; making the ministry his *work* and his *only work*; confining himself to that part of the field to which Providence directed; "deaf to all and many calls to other labors, and other fields of labor; sowing and reaping as seed-time and harvest, according to promise, have returned;" unmoved, alike, by the assaults of slander, or the praises of friendship; persevering in his toils, and, to an extent equalled by few, in his *studies*; his diligence unremitting, and his armor all on, while many a younger man may have been thinking of rest. The providence of God has given him a standing from which he may speak with weight; and the suggestions he offers will be

\* The Power of the Pulpit; or Thoughts addressed to Christian Ministers, and those who bear them. By Gardiner Spring, D. D., pastor of the Brick Presbyterian church, New York. Baker & Scribner, 1848.

received with interest and profit by the ministry and the church.

The work is addressed to "Christian ministers and those who hear them;" and is adapted to impress and be useful to both. It opens with a touching dedication to the youthful ministry of the land, and then proceeds to speak of the great topics suggested for their consideration. These are, the power of the pulpit; the truth of which it is the vehicle; the living teacher; the divine authority of the ministry; its aid from the power of God; the great object of preaching, and every thing subservient to it; the preacher's interest in his subject; the diligence, prayerfulness, piety, example, and responsibility of ministers; the ministry compared with other professions; a competent ministry to be procured; the proper education for the ministry; pecuniary support of ministers; prayer for them; the consideration due them; and the responsibility of those who enjoy their labors.

All these topics are presented with clearness, and pressed with the earnestness of a personal appeal—with the definiteness of thought and aim that we expect in a work originating in some specific, and to its author's mind impressive occurrence. In style, the work is chaste, serious, manly, marked throughout by strength, and often rising to eloquence. There is no affectation—no wandering—no attempt at rhetoric—no puerile conceit of originality. All is natural, direct, and deeply solemn. We feel that the author has forgotten self in his fullness of the subject; and under the influence of this feeling, our hearts open to a deep interest in it, as the flowers open to the sun. And this interest increases to the end, until, as we close the book, we rise from its pages with thoughtful and serious spirits, with a higher estimate of the power of the pulpit, with a deeper and more chastened sense of the

meaning of the inquiry, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

We do not mean that the work is perfect. Its method might be improved. It has some verbal defects, for which, doubtless, the proof-reader is responsible, such as Charnock for Charnock (p. 46), Waberton for Warburton, and Witus for Witusius (p. 51), Robertson and Dickenson, for Robinson and Dickinson (p. 54), Talbot for Talbot (p. 269), &c. Mistakes like these as to proper and familiar names, are not to be classed with such mere misprints as maker for matter (p. 196), and unexecuted for unexerted (p. 199), and care for ease (p. 323); but are deserving of special reprehension in a publishing firm, one of the partners of which, if we mistake not, has been a student of theology.

On the part of the author, we might object to his use of the word "depreciate" (p. 312), or to the construction of such sentences as the fifth on the 334th, the last on the 342d, and the first on the 345th pages. We can not agree with him (pp. 345, 346) that "public spirit" is, in any sense, "the prominent feature of Christianity." We doubt the correctness of the estimate (p. 331), that "not far from seventy ministers in the American church can trace their lineage to the elder Edwards;" for though the statement has so often been made, that Dr. S. is not responsible for its repetition, yet with some means of knowing, we can not make out one-third of that number. The connected statement, that "his (President Edwards') earliest known ancestor was a preacher of the Gospel, settled in London, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth," is certainly incorrect in one, and almost certainly in two respects. As to the first, Dr. Spring, being himself descended from the same stock, should have been aware, that his "known ancestors" in several lines, are easily traced back to a much earlier period

than the one he designates.\* And as to the second point, that the ancestor alluded to, "was a preacher of the Gospel, settled in London, in the time of Queen Elizabeth," it is, to say the least, highly improbable; for "*Newcourt's Reporters*" contains the name of every minister of that diocese, back to the earliest times, and it does not mention *Richard Edwards* as one of them: and in those days, it must be remembered, though there was *non-conformity*, there was no *disseant*. Whence Dr. Hopkins, who first published this statement, derived it, is now unknown; but the evidence alluded to, seems against it, though it has so often been repeated, as almost to have become a part of settled history. Other evidence renders it probable that Richard Edwards was a layman of high standing in London, possibly in some way connected with the court or household of Elizabeth herself. We should demur somewhat to Dr. Spring's estimate of *parochial schools* (p. 362); and question his implied (though commonly received) exegesis of the passage from the forty-ninth chapter of Isaiah, as to "kings being nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers," &c., the meaning of which, even Alexander, in his admirable commentary, has, we think, failed to reach.

There is another error in the work before us, calling for a more extended notice. We refer to the anecdote on the 142d page, of the preaching of President Davies before George II; an anecdote, which though utterly fictitious, has been so often repeated, not merely in almanacs and newspapers, but by well-read men, that multitudes believe it.

\* To say nothing of the paternal ancestors of President Edwards, he was directly descended from the *Wintkrops* (through Lucy, the favorite sister of the first Governor W.) and the *Dowings*, both of whom, especially the latter, were distinguished families long before the time of Elizabeth.—EDITOR.

As given by Dr. Hitt, and quoted by Dr. Barnes, in his life and times of Davies, prefixed to his edition of his sermons, it is as follows:

"His (Davies') fame as a pulpit orator was so great in London, that some noblemen who had heard him, mentioned in the presence of King George II, that there was a very distinguished dissenting preacher in London, from the colony of Virginia, who was attracting great notice, and drawing after him very crowded audiences; upon which the King expressed a strong desire to hear him, and his chaplain invited him to preach in his chapel. Mr. Davies is said to have complied, and preached before a splendid audience, composed of the royal family, and many of the nobility of the realm. It is further said, that while Mr. Davies was preaching, the King was seen speaking, at different times, to those around him, who were seen also to smile. Mr. Davies observed it, and was shocked at what he thought was irreverence in the house of God, that was utterly inexcusable in one whose example might have such influence. After pausing and looking sternly in that direction several times, the preacher proceeded in his discourse, when the same offensive behavior was still observed. The American dissenter is then said to have exclaimed, 'When the lion roars, the beasts of the forest tremble; and when King Jesus speaks, the princes of the earth should keep silence.' The King is said to have given a significant but courteous bow to the preacher, and sat very composedly and reverently during the rest of the service. If this be a correct statement of the fact that took place, it speaks louder than any thing that has yet been said in praise of Mr. Davies' promptness, intrepidity and solemn self-possession, while engaged in delivering God's messages to his perishing fellow men. Whatever authority Mr. Davies' friends had for narrating this story, is not now known; but it was universally believed among them to have occurred. The explanation given of this strange affair, is this. The King is said to have been so enraptured with Mr. Davies' solemn and impressive manner and eloquence, that he was constrained repeatedly to express his astonishment and applause to those around him, and felt any thing else but irreverence upon the occasion. He was so delighted with him, that he sent him an invitation to call upon him at a given time, which interview unquestionably did take place, and was repeated more than once; after which, and the explanations given, Mr. Davies was delighted with his Majesty, and not only received a handsome donation from him for the college whose cause he was

advocating, but was led to form a most exalted opinion of George II. ever afterwards, as may be learned from a funeral sermon he preached upon his death and character."

In the work before us, the same anecdote, in substance, is more briefly related as follows:

"That distinguished American preacher, Samuel Davies, President of the College of New Jersey, when on a visit to England, in behalf of the college, was invited to preach before George III. His youthful Queen was sitting by his side; and so enchanted were they by the preacher's eloquence, that the King expressed his admiration in no measured terms, and so audibly and rudely as to draw the attention of the audience and interrupt the service. The preacher made a sudden and solemn pause in the discourse, looked around upon the audience, and fixing his piercing eye upon England's noisy monarch, said, 'When the lion roars, the beasts of the forests tremble; when Jehovah speaks, let the kings of the earth keep silence before him!'"\*

Now this anecdote, minute as it is in its details, is utterly unsustained by evidence, and in all probability is utterly untrue. It was originally written and published by the well-known "parson Weems," who was famous not only for *telling*, but *coining* good stories. The original journal of Davies, which he kept while in England, is still in existence; and in that he has given the occurrences of each day while he was on this mission to that country in behalf of the College of New Jersey. He states distinctly *when* and *where* he preached while abroad; and he does *not* say a single word about having preached before the king: nor does he allude to the king's having made a donation to the college, though he carefully records every donation he received, and from whom he received it. And so far from *preaching*

\* In this version of the anecdote, there are two mistakes in dates; for Davies was appointed to go to England in 1753, which was six years before he was chosen president of the College of New Jersey; and George III. did not come to the throne till 1760, which was several years after his return to this country.

*before the king*, Davies states in his journal, that by the advice of his friends in England, he kept the object of his mission concealed from the knowledge of the British government, lest the charter of the college should be revoked. Governor Belcher, who gave the charter, had, by some means, fallen into bad repute with the crown, and the charter was thought to be too liberal to receive the royal favor. For these reasons, Davies did not ask aid from any one connected with the government. He received nothing from the higher clergy of the establishment, except from a bishop in Cumberland, who gave him five guineas, on the express condition, that his name should not be used in favor of the object. Such facts render it morally certain that the story, which Weems first published in an edition of Davies' sermons, is a sheer fabrication, having not the least foundation in truth.†

But if Dr. Spring is in error, as others have been before him, as to this anecdote, he more than balances the account by giving one or two that are new, or have previously been mistold, in authentic shape. The first we shall quote is as creditable to a king, as the largest subscription to the college could have been. It is as follows:

"The bishops," said George III., "are very jealous of such men!" (alluding to Whitfield.) When a distinguished prelate complained to him of the zeal of the ministers under the patronage of Lady Huntingdon, he replied, "make bishops of them; make bishops of them!" "That might be done," replied the prelate, "but we can not make a bishop of Lady Huntingdon." "Well, well," said the king, "see if you can not imitate the zeal of these men. As for her ladyship, you can not make a bishop of her, it is true; it would be a lucky circumstance if you could, for she puts you all to shame! I wish there were a lady Huntingdon in every diocese in the kingdom!"—p. 254.

† For these facts we are indebted, mainly, to the Rev. Dr. Carnahan, President of the College of New Jersey, who has stated them more fully in an interesting letter, published in the N. Y. *Observer*, some years since.

Another is well worth preserving, as giving strong testimony from a high source, to a noble but often maligned class of men—the English dissenting ministers of the last century.

"During a discussion in Parliament, some time, if I mistake not, between the years 1775 and 1780, upon the bill favorable to religious liberty, the celebrated Dr. Drummond, the Archbishop of York, attacked the dissenters with great violence, stigmatizing them as men of 'close ambition.' In reply to this attack, the elder Pitt, the earl of Chatham, made the following remarks: 'This is judging uncharitably; and whoever brings here a charge without proof, *defames*. The dissenting ministers are represented as men of close ambition. They are so, my lords; and their ambition is, to keep close to the college of fishermen, not of cardinals; to the doctrine of inspired apostles, not to the decrees of interested and aspiring bishops. They contend for a scriptural creed, and a scriptural worship; we have a *Calvinistic creed*, a *Popish liturgy*, and an *Arminian clergy*. The Reformation has laid open the Scriptures to all; let not the bishops shut them again. Laws in support of ecclesiastical power are pleaded, which it would shock humanity to execute. It is said that religious sects have done great mischief, when they were not kept under restraint; but *history offers no proof that sects have EVER been mischievous, when they were not oppressed and persecuted by the ruling church.*'"—p. 29.

Dr. Spring steps somewhat aside (p. 181) to give, in reply to an inquiry, his opinion of "Hawystone," an anonymous religious novel, of the Puseyite school, which he notices with sharp, but deserved severity. It might have been courteous in him to reply to the question of a friend, but it was hardly necessary to expose a work, the shame of whose nakedness is bare to every reflecting mind. "Hawystone" was never written for men; it was intended only to "lead captive silly women" and children; and if Professor Sewall were on the witness stand, and testifying under oath, he would doubtless confess it, unless in his progress Rome-ward, he has reached the point where, with the Jesuit, he believes it no sin to swear falsely to

a Protestant! He has too much tact, talent and shrewdness, as his "Christian Morals" shows, not to adapt himself to those he desires to influence, and the artfulness and impudence of the assertions of this work, show but too well on what level and at what objects its artillery is aimed. He doubtless understands his position, and is willing, in this case, to risk the contempt of men of sense, for the sake of the impression that unqualified and bare-faced dogmatism may make on a class so little given to thought as the habitual readers of novels, whether of the religious or any other class. If Prof. S. had said of his extra high church claims, that their very assertion, "boldly and unhesitatingly made, was, in itself" the best "evidence of their truth," we might have been disposed to admit it. But when of these same cloudy and fanciful prerogatives, he has the coolness to say, "the very claim of which, boldly and unhesitatingly made, is in itself AN evidence of their truth," we have only to say, that he has so long dealt with the pure mathematics, that he knows better! The falsehood of such a proposition, as to any subject, is as bold, as its impudence is amazing! If the Baptist chooses to dream that there are no church members but those that have been immersed, or the high churchman that there is no ministry except in his own uncharitable\* pale, in pity to their weakness let them enjoy the delusion, as the maniac does his dream, that the straw he wields is a sceptre, and he himself a king. If it either amuses or gratifies him, let him believe it, till God in mercy restore his reason; and so let them! But in

\* As an instance of what the views, sustained by such arguments as that of Prof. S., lead to in practice, we see by the late English papers, that Dr. Coleridge, the Tractarian priest of Thoverton, has expelled from his Sunday and national day schools, nine poor children, because they went out of curiosity, to see certain persons immersed by the Baptists!

compassion to their own reputation, let them not pretend to substantiate such claims by argument. Better, like Prof. S., resort at once to "bold and unhesitating" assertion!

Having disposed of these matters, we could easily fill pages on pages with valuable and striking thoughts from the work before us. Our limits, however, confine us to comparatively few of the very many we should be glad to quote. In the first chapter are some admirable remarks on the negative influences of the pulpit, worthy of consideration by all.

"There is a negative influence which the pulpit exerts, which is not always appreciated. The importance of *suppressing the vicious habits of men*, can be estimated only by the intrinsic turpitude of their vices, and the devastation and ruin which they spread over the world. It were no easy matter to calculate the vast sum of wretchedness suppressed, and misery prevented, by the influence of the Gospel. It is a thought of some interest, that the well springs of overt and public iniquity are broken up just in the measure in which the pulpit has power over the minds of men. So absolutely is it at war with immorality and vice, that the vicious and immoral almost uniformly shun its instruction. Such persons are rarely found in the houses of God. The atmosphere is one they can not live in; and the honest, faithful preacher of the Gospel, to his honor be it spoken, one whose presence and influence they can not abide. Plant a pulpit in the hot-bed of crime, and the atmosphere becomes gradually more pure; the fearful activity of wickedness is restrained, and low vices, and black crime skulk away, and seek a shadow under some deadly Upas, rather than regale themselves beneath the tree of life. Men are not found worshiping a golden image, or a block of marble, or a crawling reptile, in lands where the Christian pulpit has a place. Those depraved passions, and stupid and degraded vices, everywhere the attendants on the debasing systems of idolatry, prevail only in lands where this divine institution is not known, or where it just begins to be recognized. If the land in which we dwell is not as debased as ancient Egypt, or Phoenicia, or Babylon, or modern India, and if our sacred rites are not such as to shock every mind that is touched with the least sense of decency and virtue, it is because the pulpit guards it by purer influences. Go to lands where there are no

pulpits, or to those portions of the world where they are few and far between, and what do you hear, if not the most awful profanation of the name of the great God, even from the lips of hisping childhood and hoary age? And what do you see, if not the most mournful desecration of that day of rest which the King of the universe claims for his own; which the God of life has given for the physical, intellectual, and moral benefit of man; and without which, no bounds can be set to the grossest ignorance and the grossest crimes? Who can tell the amount of wickedness which would be found in the various relations of human life, if the strong bonds of social organization were not inwoven with the uttered truths of God, and watched over and fortified by his ministers? Where would be the subordination of subjects to rulers, and of children to their parents? And what would become of those ties of affection and delicacy, which now bind so many thousand hearts, and which keep Christian lands from presenting the most dreadful scenes of anarchy and confusion, contention and hatred? How many terrible convulsions has the warning voice of the pulpit suppressed or restrained? Men would be well nigh fiends without it. Spectacles of horror would be spread around them. Their hand would be against every man, and every man's hand against them. The sword would be bathed in blood, and their history written in mourning, lamentation and wo. And has the pulpit checked no licentiousness, imposed no restriction upon dissoluteness and profligacy of manners, prevented no libertinism, and kept no unhappy female, and no reckless man from going down to the chambers of death? Has it set no bounds to idleness and prodigality, to iniquity, dishonesty, and fraud, to plunder and pillage? Has it not done more to keep men from this whole class of crimes, than all the circumspection and vigilance of the civil law, and the strong arm of physical power? Has it made no liar tremble, no slanderer silent, no revengeful man peaceable, no deceiver ashamed, no compact sacred, no oath binding, no tribunal of justice more pure? Has it done nothing to repress that unhallowed spirit of covetousness, which would gratify its inextinguishable cravings by wrong-doing; which would corrupt magistrates and legislators, and enrich itself by trading in the souls of men? Has ambition never covered before it? And has it effected no diminution in the struggles and contests, the sufferings and sorrows of mankind?"—pp. 11-14.

We might quote an equally admirable passage on the positive influence of the pulpit from the same,

or one on its *history* from the second chapter ;—or from the fifth, a highly eloquent and affecting description of the emotions with which the pulpit will be remembered in eternity, on the one hand by the saved, and on the other by the lost ;—or the *whole* of the sixth, showing with great clearness and power, how the pulpit is forever in conflict with error, and ignorance, and the indifference, and hostility of the human mind ; or from the seventh, some striking thoughts on the power of the living voice ; or again, the whole of the tenth and eleventh, on the importance of having a single eye to the great work of preaching, and on ministerial diligence.

In the eleventh chapter, we are glad to hear Dr. Spring say, "*of all the labors of a minister, THE MOST IMPORTANT IS PREPARATION FOR THE PULPIT.* The *pulpit* is his *great* sphere of action ; the work of the *pulpit* is *THE great work* to which God has appointed him ;"—and again, in the twelfth chapter, "*the GREAT object of every minister of the gospel ought to be, to give the SERVICES OF THE PULPIT the preëminence over every other department of ministerial labor.*" This is a most important truth, and we are glad to see it so decidedly and strongly stated from such a source. For it is too much a fashion of the times, with some at least, comparatively to undervalue *preaching*, and to give it, and preparation for it, but a secondary, at least *not a paramount* place. They would have a minister on school committees, at public celebrations, in prayer meetings, always in the Sabbath school, and especially and constantly occupied with "visiting." Their counsel would be "visit all the week, and 'extemporize' on the Sabbath ; and very few will know the difference, and the people will like it all the better." Ruinous, fatal counsel to the minister unwise enough to follow it! The sad result would be,

Vol. VI.

64

that he would soon preach his church empty, and have no congregation left to visit ;—for few persons are so lost to common sense, as long to waste their Sabbaths in trying to listen to sermons in which there is nothing to which to listen, and to which no effort at attention, however honestly made, can enable them to attend. The surest way to run down and run out a congregation, is to neglect thorough preparation for the pulpit :—the surest way to build one up in numbers, as well as in knowledge and grace, is to bring "*beaten oil—beaten oil to the sanctuary.*"—"No one," remarks Dr. Johnson, "ever did a thing well, to which he did not give the whole bent of his mind ;" and the late Dr. Mason is reported to have said to his people, "If I had visited you half as much as you were *kind* enough to *wish* me to, or *unreasonable* enough to *expect* me to, I should long ago have been dismissed for stupidity in preaching."

Let us not be misunderstood in these remarks. We are the last to undervalue pastoral visiting in its place. We believe that *everything* should give way for the pastor's visits to the poor and distressed, to the sick, the afflicted and the dying. Such visits, if made as they should be, are but preaching in the most favorable circumstances possible ;—for "when the world is covered with gloom, and nothing remains but the remembrance of departed joys," or when the individual is just entering the passway of death, every word, whether of counsel or prayer, comes with the weight of eternity to the soul. But as to general and promiscuous "visiting," two important ends are to be sought by it, either the suggestion of some topic or source of useful moral instruction, or the creation or confirmation of a mutual personal interest between pastor and people. Without one or both of these objects, the visits of a pastor, like too many of

the visits of fashionable life, will be idle, insipid, and useless ceremonies. And for the attainment of either of them, a single wisely chosen sentence, or one truly feeling word, is better than whole hours of formal staying, or heartless conversation, in which the faithful minister has no time to waste. *Hearers* should *learn to remember*, and the *minister* should *never forget*, that ordinary pastoral intercourse is but a subordinate department of the sacred office. His great object, the burden of his commission, is, to *preach Christ and him crucified*: and there is no hope of successfully *preaching* without *studying Christ*; for if we do not *study* what we *teach*, we shall *teach* what we do not *know*. The first great object of the preacher should be, to see that it is not *his fault if the sanctuary is not filled on the Sabbath*; and of this, he can never be sure, unless his preaching be such as to interest, feed, instruct, edify his hearers. "We know," says one who was a hearer of the late Dr. Chalmers, "how great a privilege it is to have to look forward to the ministrations of the Sabbath, not as wearinesses, which, simply as a matter of duty, were to be endured, but as exquisite feasts, spiritual and intellectual, which were to be greatly relished and enjoyed. And when hearing it sometimes regretted, with reference to at least one remarkable man," (Dr. C.) "that he did not visit his flock quite so often as was desirable, (many of the complainants' sole idea of a ministerial visit, being, simply, that it was a long exordium of agreeable gossip, with a short tail piece of prayer stuck to its latter end,) we have strongly felt how immensely better it was that the assembled congregation should enjoy, each year, fifty-two Sabbaths of their minister at his best, than that the tone of his pulpit services should be lowered, in order that each individual among them might

enjoy a yearly half hour of him apart. We fully recognize the importance, in its own subordinate place, of ministerial visitation, especially when conducted as it ought to be. But the church must not be sacrificed to the ungrounded idea, that it occupies a level as high or even nearly as high as the preaching of the word."

The fifteenth chapter, is tender and touching, suggesting to the minister many considerations of the deepest solemnity and weight. We quote but a single passage, setting forth in striking and spirited language, a truth of equal interest to all. Speaking of obedience to God's commandments as the sum and substance of religion, Dr. S. says:

"O! it is a great matter, in heart and life, to abstain from those things which God has forbidden, and to do those that he has required. It alters not the importance of this remark, that such a righteousness is not a sinner's justification. It is all his *religion*. Impulses of fancy, animal emotions, vague and dreamy sentimentalism may inweave themselves with the intellectual temperaments and habits of good men, and give their piety its lights and shadows; but they form no part of their piety. That fervor which glows only to obey, and those impulses which impel to do and to suffer the will of God, are alone worthy of confidence. Men are dead in trespasses and sins, because they never *obey* God;—devils are devils, because they live in *disobedience*. And Christian men and ministers are Christians, just in the measure in which they are *obedient*. Faith is as obedient, as it is confiding; love as dutiful, as it is affectionate; humility as submissive, as it is lowly; penitence as much afraid of sinning, as it sorrows for sin; joy as quick to do the will of God, hearkening to the voice of his word, as it is enrapturing and transporting; and zeal as warm and steadfast in giving battle to all that is wrong, as it is when it burns with its boldest and most active spirituality. It is a dry doctrine, a dead orthodoxy, and no more resembles true piety than a marble statue does a living man, that does not express itself in obedience. There is amazing force in that remonstrance of Samuel to Saul, 'To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.' Afflictive fastings and fervent prayers, devout contemplation, eloquent

sermons, fitting religious conversation, and commended sanctity, are sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal, compared with cheerful obedience to the will of God. Nor in saying these things, do we forget, that the Lord looketh on the heart, and requires a spiritual religion. The religion that is all internal, and the religion that is all external are upon the same footing; both are bad: the former all emotion, and alternate rapture and grief, and empty imagination; the latter, the form of godliness without its power. What is piety, but that state of mind and moral feeling which regards God as God; loves him as God; obeys him as God, and honors him as Lawgiver and Redeemer? What is piety, but the love of the creature, so responding to the love of the Creator, that in defiance of every opposing claim, whether of corruption within or the world without, and in opposition to every other master, it makes the Redeeming Savior its Lord, and perfects holiness in his love and fear? What is piety, but that great astounding" (?) "principle, which, while it is the main spring of action in the heart, has the vigor and efficacy to make itself felt in every artery, and vein, and muscle, and delicate nerve of the moral man? Strong spiritual exercises, under the powerful impression of scriptural truth, are characteristic of a healthful state of moral feeling, only when they are sufficiently strong to make us love and perform the will of our Father which is in heaven. This is the piety which the pulpit solicits in order to give it power."

In the sixteenth chapter, in connection with other striking thoughts on the example of ministers, Dr. S. says:

"It is too much to expect that the ministers of Christ should be perfect men. \* \* \* We are not apologists for human imperfection; yet we do pity the man, who, in this fallen world, expects to find *everything* in his minister to gratify either his *piety* or his *pride*. He can have little knowledge of himself, and little of that charity which hopeth all things and coveth a multitude of sins, who can not appreciate true excellence because it has blemishes. It were a rare combination to find any one man possessing all the personal qualifications to be desired in those who minister at the altar. The *beau ideal* may be a very agreeable picture to the imagination, but it will never be realized. It was, indeed, once realized; but it was too unearthly for this low world, too pure for men to look upon. They defiled it; yea, they spit upon it, and smote it with their hands, and exclaimed, '*Let him be crucified!*'"—p. 294.

And again:

"I am acquainted with men who are in the habit of sitting in severe judgment upon the character of ministers; but they are suspicious men, rash men, and men whose word would be taken with some grains of allowance in a court of justice!"—p. 295.

And still again;

"There are not wanting those who impugn the character of the Christian ministry, because they do not carry the *solemnity* of the pulpit into all the scenes of social life. Many, indeed, are the scenes of social life where the solemnity of the pulpit is called for; nor in any of them, are the dignity and proprieties of ministerial character unfitting. But as well might secular time be transformed into the Sabbath, and the busy scenes of the world into the formal services of the sanctuary, as the emotions of the pulpit pervade the uniform intercourse of a minister, either with the people of God, or the men of the world. Levity and worldliness are sufficiently out of place in him who is an ambassador of God to guilty men: but affected solemnity is worse. Ministers there are, who are so solemn, that you never see a smile or a pleasant expression on their countenances. They are absolutely *fearful*! There is no piety in this. Were an angel from heaven to dwell with men, his spirit and example would be a perpetual rebuke to such ministers. Christianity, though of divine origin, is not the religion of angels: it is *engrafted on human nature*. The whole arrangement is adapted to what is human; and while its great object is to purify and elevate, it is no part of its design to terrify. It is not a sort of personified apathy; nor is it some ghastly messenger that lives only among the tombs. It moves among men, as the messenger of heaven's tenderest mercy; and though wherever it goes, it rebukes iniquity, its footsteps are radiant with light and love. It multiplies the joys of men, and only admonishes them that they may not be *sinful joys*."—p. 300.

The chapter on the responsibility of ministers, abounds in thrilling considerations to every ambassador of Christ. The two on the sources of the supply for the ministry are full of valuable suggestions to the ministry and the churches. We agree with Dr. Spring, that "it were a calamity greatly to be deplored, that we should act on the principle, *that poverty and low birth are essential qualifications for the Chris-*

tian ministry; and that a well-bred man is disqualified from becoming a minister of the gospel because he is well-bred, and the son of a rich man disqualified because he is rich." But we have never yet seen evidence that "such is the strong tendency of the public mind," or "that the church of God and the ministry themselves scarcely think of looking for men to serve the Lord Jesus in his sanctuary, save to the poor." Our strong impression, is that there has been the disposition to seek out and welcome, alike, those of both classes to the sacred office, and if more of one than of the other class have actually been brought forward to it, it was because all that could be gathered from both, were still not enough to meet the exigencies of the church and the world.

Several other topics are suggested for remark in these and the subsequent chapters; and we would gladly quote what is said, in the nineteenth chapter, as to the *social standing* of the apostles and primitive preachers; as to the *different professions*; as to *education societies*, &c. But as we have already exceeded our intended limits, we pass to the topic of the twentieth chapter, "*the fitting education for the Christian ministry.*"

The suggestions on this subject, present some thoughts that are new, some that are valuable, and some that are debatable. The whole chapter has already been discussed with some earnestness, and we think with rather more sensitiveness than was called for, by a writer of high ability in one of the religious quarterlies of the day.\* This writer understands Dr. Spring to "avow his *preference* for the *private* method of theological education, by *pastors*, to the *public* or *academical* method, now almost universally adopted in this country." We do

not so understand him. He does, indeed, suggest some advantages of the *old* course, that he thinks might, and ought to be *added* to those of the *new*; and as far as such advantages can be shown, all, we think, will agree with him. But so far from expressing any such "*preference*" for the *old system*, as would exclude the *new*, he says of the transition from the former to the latter: "It is quite obvious that *something* has been *lost* by the change; and it is *equally* obvious that *something* has been *gained*." If I were called upon to strike the balance, I frankly confess I should be not a little embarrassed." Is this the expression of a *preference*? Again, Dr. S., after presenting the thoughts which have passed through his mind on the subject, remarks: "These and other considerations would lead to the conclusion, that our theological seminaries *must be sustained*;" nor does he any where say, when setting forth his views on the opposite side of the question, "these and other considerations would lead to the conclusion, that these seminaries *must be abolished*." He does, indeed, query whether the "evils incidental to this" (the public) "system of instruction may not be *remedied*;" and whether it is not "possible to give our theological institutions such a direction, that they shall be *better* than they are, and more certainly accomplish the benevolent designs of those who founded them?" But this is a very different thing, from proposing to *abolish* them—as much so, as the request to the watchmaker to clean or repair the watch, is, from requesting him to *destroy* it. Still further, Dr. S., suggesting that public seminaries have dangers, (which his reviewer not only does not question, but justly intimates they have, even *more* than he has maintained,) goes on to show, *how these dangers may be obviated*, saying, among other things, "it must be by a watchful eye over the

\* Biblical Repertory, July, 1848.

young men who are there pursuing their theological education." Is this again, the language of one who is *opposed* to theological seminaries, or would destroy them? If Dr. S. were opposed, the chapter before us would have presented a very different train of remark from the one he has chosen. As it now stands, the whole burden of it, is the language of a friend, *advocating improvement and the removal of evils*; not that of an *enemy desiring extirpation*. If Dr. S. were the latter, he has the *sense* to have made the entire staple of his twentieth chapter different from what it is, and the *honesty and courage*, we trust, openly to speak his opinion.

But, says the reviewer, "his argument is reducible to these three propositions: that the ministry has sensibly degenerated; that this deterioration has in part arisen from the theological seminaries; and that this deteriorating influence of seminaries, is owing, in great measure, to the practice of making men professors who have had no pastoral experience. Our readers need not be told that this is a most serious matter. \* \* \* If the doctrine of this chapter is true, and if the impression which it is adapted and designed to produce, should become general, then not only must those of our professors who have not been pastors be dismissed from office, \* \* \* but all theological seminaries should at once be suppressed, &c."

Except as to the question whether Dr. S. is a *friend* or an *enemy* to theological seminaries, we do not propose holding the balance between him and his reviewer, but rather to state what appear to us correct views on some of the topics alluded to in the quotation just made.

We do not believe, then, that "the ministry has sensibly degenerated;" that the "pulpit is less powerful than it was in the days of our fathers." Come the acknowledgment or assertion from what quarter

it may, we can not but regard it as an unfounded generalization from far too few facts to sustain it, or as the unreflecting or mistaken impression of the spirit that is forever and in all things dreaming "the former days were better than these." If "THE *pulpit*" and "THE *ministry*" mean any thing, they must mean not here and there *an isolated pulpit*, or *a solitary minister*, but *pulpits* and *ministers in general*. And mankind being the same, it seems absurd to admit, that "the *means* of more mature study, and the *excitements* to more mature study have been *constantly increasing*," and yet to argue, not only that "improvement" has not been made, "but a real decline has been going on." It would be a marvel, indeed, if while every other profession and calling had, as a whole, been advancing, the *ministry* had been going backward! So far from this being the case, every reliable indication shows the very reverse to be true. The great increase of all evangelical denominations, the multiplication of churches and church members, and the comparatively elevated character of those members; the contributions for benevolent purposes, the decline of intelligent infidelity, the spread of temperance, the amount of ministerial labors; the number and zeal, and exertions of our domestic and foreign missionaries; the spread of the missionary spirit, and the vastly increased general influence of religion and religious considerations in the community; all these are indications—*demonstrations*, that the *ministry* has not degenerated, but vastly improved.

The "accomplished author," quoted by Dr. Spring, points us in one generation, to Dickinson, Edwards, Burr, the Tennents, Blair, Davies and Finley, and in another to Strain, Duffield, Witherspoon, McWhorter, Waddell, Wilson, Rodgers and Hoge. But with two or three exceptions in the *first* class, and we had almost

said none in the *second*, we believe that men of the present century (many of them living) might be mentioned, who are their equals. And so far as any one of all the number *was* above the level of the present age, he was still more above the level of his own. One or two mountain peaks are no criterion of the general elevation of the continent from which they may happen to rise. We were not a little amused, in a recent conversation on this subject, with a discerning and highly intelligent minister, to find, that for *his great men* in the sacred profession, he came down to a still later date, than that of the second class given above. And we have but little doubt, that the coming age, will refer to men like Mason, Cornelius, Richards, Buckminster, Larned, Bedell, Griffin, Breckenridge, and Nettleton, (to say nothing of some scores of those now living,) as proof of the peculiarly high character of the American pulpit in the first half of the nineteenth century. And who can say that half a century hence, some prominent writer may not be found asserting that "the pulpit is degenerating," and by way of proof, parading such names as Alexander, Barnes, Beecher, Mason, Park, Stone, Spring, Taylor, Tyng, Wayland, and possibly even Finney!

The truth is, that *greatness* is very much a matter of *distance*;—no man looks for it in his own village, or town, or neighborhood; and no age, but in some one preceding. The distance not only "lends enchantment," but covers defects. There is almost always fog enough over the past for the objects that are seen at all in it to *loom up*, far higher than their real level. Position, again, is often mistaken for greatness—the place being looked to as the gauge of the individual filling it, as the outer clothing of the man may be (*by courtesy*) supposed to be some indication of the form and amount of bones and muscles with-

in. So too, the associations and estimates of early life, are very apt to be retained and carried on to later days. We have known a marble-playing urchin, nudging his associate, as two recently licensed theological students passed by, and somewhat peremptorily intimating, that he "had better get out of the way" of those rather *venerable* gentlemen! And if all the parties lived to grow up, it is more than likely that the former would look upon the latter as among the great men of the age! Goldsmith's village schoolmaster was, doubtless, *the great man* to all his pupils down to their latest days.

We might give still other reasons of this too common tendency, in every age and department of life, to undervalue the present in comparison with the past. But enough has been said to be a basis for the suggestion that the world has *not* constantly been degenerating—that it is not among the impossibilities of the future, that the present age may yet be pointed to, in the department of *the ministry*, as in all things else, as equal, if not superior to any that has gone before it. We will but add by way of offset to the opinion we are controverting, that judging by the estimate that *fathers, mothers and nurses* of every generation (not excepting the present) form of *the children*, the world must *always have been and still be rapidly and wonderfully improving*!

But if it were the fact, that *the ministry* is an exception to all other professions and callings, which we do not admit,—if while *they* have been steadily improving, it has been deteriorating, which we do not believe; still it does not follow that the deterioration is owing to *theological seminaries*; nor do we understand Dr. Spring to say that it is. He does, indeed, dwell on points, in which he thinks seminaries might be improved, and he also urges that young men, after the completion of their seminary course, should spend

three or six months with some settled pastor; but it no more follows that he supposes his assumed degeneracy of the ministry is to be traced *entirely* to the defects of those institutions, than *entirely* to non-compliance with this proposed arrangement. The suggestion of one or two causes of the supposed state of a given profession, is not to be taken as the assertion that they are the *sole* causes, unless all others are explicitly denied. And not only does Dr. Spring not deny other causes, but he admits in behalf of his entire presbytery as well as himself, that they have licensed not a few young men from seminaries to preach the gospel, whom, but for their having spent three years at these institutions, and but for the recommendation of their professors, they would have *refused* to license; —a statement, which either shows the high confidence that he and his co-presbyters have in the seminaries and their professors, or else admits the mortifying and disgraceful fact, that a presbytery so respectable as the one alluded to, has been afraid to act up to its convictions, in *refusing* the licenses in question. No one, probably, would understand Dr. S. as intending to confess the gross unfaithfulness and dereliction of duty implied in this last alternative; and if not, then there is the admission of an estimate of theological seminaries, so high, as to render utterly absurd the idea that the degeneracy of the ministry is entirely owing to these institutions.

It is true Dr. Spring says, "*Let the teachers of those who are being educated for the ministry, be men of no inconsiderable experience in the pastoral office;*" and that he presses this thought with all the earnestness of one who has pondered a point till both his judgment and feelings are deeply enlisted in its favor. But he urges this, not as the *universal* and *exclusive*, but only as the *general* rule, which he thinks "ought rarely,

if ever, to be dispensed with." And again, he says, "the safety and excellence of the seminaries of the Presbyterian church, is found, *thus far*, in this combined influence. Like the original apostolic college, so wisely established by the Savior, age with youth, pastoral experience, with scholastic learning, &c.," "have, under God, made our seminaries what they are."

Now all this language seems to us definite and clear; and it is the key to the whole chapter. It is not the language of one asserting that the degeneracy of the ministry is owing to theological seminaries, and that *their* degenerating influence comes from the practice of making men professors who have had no pastoral experience: for it not only admits exceptions to the proposed rule, but it commends the seminaries of the Presbyterian church as "*thus far*" conducted; and "*thus far*" they have had some professors who *have*, and others who have *not* been pastors. And then, again, as if to avoid all possible misapprehension, it speaks of a "*combined influence*," "*age with youth*"—not both surely in the same person—and "*pastoral experience, with scholastic learning*"—the parallelism requiring the sense, that the "*pastoral experience*" may be the attribute of one professor, and the "*scholastic learning*" of another. The whole argument seems to us that of a man contemplating two entirely different systems, the "*pastoral*" and "*scholastic*"; two entirely different kinds of seminaries, the professors in one of which, shall, *as the general rule*, be men of pastoral experience, and in the other, mere literary men, strangers to the pastoral office, and of course to the varied and valuable experience arising from it. And of the two *systems*, he decidedly prefers the *former*—of the two *kinds* of seminaries, *that* in which the *pastoral* professorships and influence shall *predominate*. It is not a course

of special or indirect pleading against any existing professors, honored and beloved by all who know them, and who will ever be remembered with the warmest interest and affection by all who have enjoyed their instructions; but a decided and strong advocacy of the position, *that, other things being equal, the professorships in our theological seminaries should, as the general rule, be filled with those who have had some experience in the pastoral work.* And in this ground, we believe Dr. Spring will be *universally sustained*, even by those professors who have not been pastors; for it is hardly conceivable that they, or any one could regard the experience of a pastor, a *disadvantage* to a professor of any department whatever. Every one must feel, that *only a pastor* is qualified to profess and teach *pastoral theology*; that the experience of a pastor has the most important bearings on *sermonizing*, and *didactic theology*; and that even in the more "scholastic" departments of *church history* and the *sacred classics*, the practical and experimental aspects of a doctrine, may have much to do with interpretation, and acquaintance with the church *now*, with the construction to be put on her *past* phases, and her modes of thought and action in the future. Other qualifications may be such as to sustain, and more than sustain the choice of an individual professor, who has never been a pastor; but, *other things being equal*, the fact that a man has successfully discharged the duties of the pastoral office is sufficient to turn the scale. We hope Dr. Spring may be mistaken—entirely mistaken in saying: "the fact may no longer be dissembled, that the *tendency*, if not the *design* of our *theological seminaries themselves*, is, to *fill the most important chairs with purely literary men*; men who neither have, nor expect to have any relation to the pastoral office, men ordained not to the work

of the ministry, but to a *professorship*." If he is *not*, it is high time for the churches and ministry to see to it, that a tendency *so full of danger* is checked and destroyed. But if he is, as we can not but think he is, then if the chapter before us were modified as to some of its expressions, we believe it would be received with almost universal approbation.

The remaining chapters of the work, addressed not so much to "ministers," as to "those that hear them," are full of important considerations to the churches, and their individual members. The "pecuniary support of ministers," the "consideration due to the ministry," and "prayer for ministers," are topics inwoven with every interest of the church and of religion. Would that over the entrance of every sanctuary, and above every pulpit, could be inscribed in letters of gold: "*Let the thought sink deep into the heart of every church, THAT THEIR MINISTER WILL BE VERY MUCH SUCH A MINISTER AS THEIR PRAYERS MAY MAKE HIM;*"—and again: "*Nothing gives a people so much interest in their minister, and interest of the best kind, as to PRAY for him. They love him more, and respect him more, and attend more cheerfully and profitably on his ministrations, the more they commend him to God in their prayers;*" and again: "*Let the ministers of the gospel have an HABITUAL remembrance at the family altar.*"

The last chapter, on the "responsibility of hearing the gospel," is one that should be read and pondered by every one who attends, or might attend the sanctuary, or improve the Sabbath. It is full of weighty and affecting considerations—pressing home to the conscience the fearful truth, that the gospel must be a *savor of life*, or a *savor of death* to all that hear it; connecting the *pulpit* with the richer salvation, or the deeper damnation of

every soul! Oh, that all could read, and be made by the Holy Spirit to feel it! Every Sabbath and sermon would then be improved, and the gospel be the wisdom and power of God to salvation, to many, who from now misimproving it, will but sink to death under an aggravated doom! The *pulpit*—every pulpit, will be remembered with joy or with remorse and anguish, in the world of light or the abodes of despair!

We cordially welcome every effort made by Dr. Spring, through the press, to serve his generation. We should rejoice if more of our

*fathers* in the ministry would imitate his laudable example in this respect. From their varied and rich experience they might leave many a lesson to do good, long after they have gone to their reward. And even if they tell us, that as a profession we are degenerating, we will hear it with the meekness of humility, though with the incredulity of unbelief, and still endeavor so to profit by their counsels of wisdom, that all beholders, as they see us, shall say, “*The spirit of Elijah doth rest upon Elisha!*”

#### CHRIST IN HISTORY.

TRUE religion consists in the love and service of the true God. By the angels who have not sinned, the true God may be approached *directly*, without the intervention of a Mediator. But it is not so with men. Our entire race have revolted from God, and become the objects of his just displeasure; and we can have audience and acceptance with him, and come into a situation to receive his blessing, only on the ground of the Gospel.

To us, therefore, the true religion is the religion of *the Gospel*. And as this is the only religion for man, so it is *the only source of virtue and happiness*. Without the religion of the Gospel, founded in the blood of Christ and applied by the influence of the Holy Spirit, man, in no situation, under no circumstances, neither in this world nor in any other, can rise to his proper dignity and glory, and be truly and permanently happy.

As much as this God has told us, often, in his word; and we should have reason to believe him, even if we had no other evidence. For does not God know? And would he knowingly deceive us, in a con-

cern of so much importance? In this instance, however, God has not shut up his people to his simple word; but in the entire history of the world, for almost six thousand years, has been illustrating before their eyes *the sole sufficiency of Christ and his Gospel*, as a ground of happiness for man. All history, indeed, whether ecclesiastical or civil, sacred or profane, is but a continued practical illustration of this great truth.

To make the illustration the more perfect, so as to cut men off from every other dependence, and lead them to trust in Christ alone, God has been pleased to try—or rather to permit—a great variety of *experiments*,—and such experiments as, to sinful men, might seem the most hopeful,—just to show them the worthlessness of such experiments, and convince them that, if they would be happy, they must come to Christ and receive the Gospel.

One of the first of these experiments was that of a *long probation*. It might have been said, if the experiment had not been tried and failed, that nothing more was ne-

necessary, in order to the improvement and happiness of men, than that they should live a long time in the world. Only give them a sufficient probation, a long space for repentance, time enough in which to grow wise and good, and the great object of life will certainly be secured. They must, at length, be weary of sin, and weaned from it, and become universally holy and happy. But this pretence, however plausible it may have appeared once, can not be offered now. The experiment has been tried, and has signally failed. In the first ages of the world, God favored mankind with a long probation. He protracted their lives to the period of almost a thousand years. He gave them time enough, in all reason, in which to become happy here, and prepare for happiness hereafter. And what was the consequence of this long probation? Did men become universally wise and good? Was the earth filled with holiness and happiness? Or has not the pen of inspiration, which has recorded little else respecting those early times, faithfully recorded this; that "the wickedness of man was then great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil, and that continually?" "The earth," we are told, "was corrupt before God;" it "was filled with violence;" and nothing remained but that, in awful judgment, it must be destroyed. The floods of the Almighty must be rolled over it, to purge it of its heaven-daring impiety, and wash out the traces of its pollution.

Another experiment of those early times was that of *separating* men one from another, and scattering them abroad on the face of the earth. Perhaps it was thought by some of the early descendants of Noah, (as it has been by some of his later descendants,) that there was no inherent corruption in men; that their wickedness was the result of bad in-

fluences and example; and that if they were only separated, the virtuous from the vicious, the precious from the vile, a portion of them, at least, would escape contamination, and be able to preserve themselves pure. And so God was pleased to put this opinion to the test. He did early separate his wayward and rebellious creatures. He confounded their language, and scattered them abroad on the face of the earth. Some settled in India, some in Egypt, some in Canaan, some in the wild regions of the north, and some in the Grecian isles; and from these primeval nurseries of men, the race rapidly diffused itself, till it is found in every corner of the earth. There is not a sea or ocean which restless man has not traversed. There is not a continent or island, mountain or plain, which he has not visited, and where his habitations are not seen. Surely, if scattering mankind was likely to reform them, they ought long ago to have been thoroughly reformed. They ought ere this to have become universally wise and good. What then have they become? What has been the result of this general diffusion? Where is the colony or tribe that has so elevated itself, as to disprove its descent from a fallen father,—or as to contradict the asseveration of heaven, that we are all "by nature children of wrath?" The experiment has been a long one, and the issue of it is plain and unanswerable. Wherever on the face of the earth man is found, he is found corrupt. Wherever he exists, he is naturally the same sordid, selfish being. To whatever quarter of the earth the eye of the Omnipotent may be directed, he must say of men now, as he did in ancient times, "They are all gone aside; they are together become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no not one." They all alike need the Gospel; need it now as much as ever; and must be elevated, sanctified, and saved by it, or not at all.

A third experiment which God has permitted to be tried, is that of *other and idolatrous religions*. But for this experiment, it might have been said, that to shut men up to a single religion,—a single method of worshiping God and securing his favor, would be exclusive and illiberal. The religious principle in man must be allowed to develop itself more freely. The invisible God is too spiritual, too intangible, to be made the object of universal worship. The creatures of sense, we need something palpable to the senses. The great lights of heaven,—the sun, the moon, and stars,—images of curious workmanship, the symbols, the representatives of an indwelling divinity—let these be the objects of worship, at least to uncultivated minds, and they will undoubtedly be more devout, more religious, and proportionally more happy.

Thus reasoned the original advocates of idol worship; and thus might we have reasoned, had not the experiment been fairly tried. But it has been tried. It has been tried on a large scale, and for a long time. Men have worshiped the sun, moon, and stars. They have worshiped idols which their own hands have made. They have worshiped birds, beasts, and creeping things. But instead of becoming more religious and happy, they have been uniformly and dreadfully degraded by such worship. They have been depraved and corrupted under its influence. They have sunk down from one degree of debasement to another, till they have lost, in great measure, the attributes of humanity, and become almost like the brutes themselves. We may not pretend to fathom all the designs of heaven, in permitting the long and terrible reign of idolatry in the earth. But this, undoubtedly, was among these designs; to convince men, by actual experiment, as to the nature and tendency of all

such impious inventions, and the folly of trusting to them as a ground of peace.

Still another experiment which has been tried, in the fruitless search after happiness, is that of *learning, philosophy, and the arts*. It might have been said, but for this experiment, that it is only necessary to our highest welfare to improve the understanding and the taste. Let the mind be cultivated and enlightened. Let its thoughts be elevated and enlarged. Let it be enriched with oriental wisdom, and liberalized and refined by literary pursuits. Let the secrets of nature be investigated, and the arts be carried to the highest perfection. By such means, surely, the heart will be softened, the character improved, and a foundation of virtue and happiness will be laid. Thus reasoned the votaries of mere learning thousands of years ago; and thus they reason now. And far be it from us to say that there is nothing plausible in such reasonings. To inform and improve the understanding, to refine and cultivate the taste, to advance in all useful knowledge, is certainly a dignified and praiseworthy employment. But does it, of itself, and of necessity, improve the character? Does it raise the thoughts and the heart to God? Does it subdue the power and secure the pardon of sin, and thus open a fountain of holy, spiritual, and enduring enjoyment? The experiment has been often tried,—tried in different ages, and under various circumstances; and we hesitate not to say that it has always failed. Some of the most learned men in the ancient world were some of the basest men. And the times when the lamp of learning shone brightest in Greece and Rome, were times of the greatest corruption and wickedness. In the days of *Aechines* and *Demosthenes*, the Grecian states had become so corrupt, that they were no longer

capable of governing themselves: And long before learning was advanced to its highest perfection at Rome, the stern virtues of the earlier Roman character, and with them the republic itself, had disappeared. The most elegant literature, and the most atrocious wickedness, flourished at Rome together.

Such was the experience of the ancient world; and that of the modern European world has been the same. Else, why has France been proverbially denominated, "the land of science and of sin?" And why has plodding, delving, literary Germany produced such hordes of infidels? The truth is, mere intellectual culture, however important on other accounts, has no necessary tendency to improve the heart. So far from this, it rather enables its possessor to sin with a more ruinous influence, and a bolder hand. And all this has been illustrated by a thousand experiments, under different forms, and at different periods of the world.

A fifth experiment which God has permitted to be tried, in the search after happiness, is that of *civil government*,—*different forms* of government,—governments *great*, and *rich*, and *powerful*. Civil government is an institution of God, intended for our well being in the present life. It was never designed to be an ultimate source of happiness, either to rulers or ruled; and yet men, in their folly, have been led thus to regard it. And so God has permitted them to try the experiment. It has been tried under a variety of forms; under every form, indeed, which human ingenuity can invent. There has been the patriarchal form of government, and the monarchical. There have been aristocracies and democracies, oligarchies and republics. There have been governments absolute and limited, pure and mixed. Nations great and powerful have risen up, one after another, and spread themselves

over the face of the earth,—the Babylonian, the Persian, the Grecian, the Roman; they have been splendid in affluence, and terrible in power, devouring, breaking in pieces, and stamping the residue with their feet. But have they promoted general happiness, or have they obstructed it? Have they given it, or taken it away? The experiment has been often tried; and the pen of history has recorded the result. In a great majority of cases, the governments of this world have been despotic, arbitrary, tyrannical, oppressive; plundering what they ought to have protected, and rendering life itself more a burden than a blessing. They have involved their subjects in cruel and almost perpetual wars, bathing the earth with blood, and filling it with the slain.

It is mournful to look back on the experiment we are now considering, and see how an institution of God, which was intended for a blessing, has been perverted into a curse. Nor has the perversion been confined to any particular forms of government. Free governments and despotic have been alike ambitious, grasping, and oppressive; thus proving, conclusively, that it is vain to look to governments alone to make man happy.

Another experiment which God has permitted to be tried, is that of leaving men, without learning or arts, without any settled forms of religion and government, to live as it is called in the *state of nature*. Infidels and enthusiasts have long been crying down what they term the artificial modes of life, and crying up the state of nature. Only let civil government be abolished, and the right of property be taken away; let learning and the arts be forgotten, and man be permitted to roam the common earth in his native liberty, subsisting by the chase, and on the spontaneous productions of the fields and woods; and then he will

be happy. Men in our own time, who reason in this way, do not consider how long, and how often, this same experiment has been tried. It was this state of nature, probably, which filled the antediluvian world with violence, and provoked the Almighty to come out in wrath against it, and destroy it. It was the attempt to live after the same manner, which led to the earliest oppressions after the deluge. Nimrod was "a mighty hunter," subsisting by the chase, and living after the course of nature; and he seems to have been, for the time, the great oppressor and corrupter of the world. And from that age to the present, wherever we find man in what is called the state of nature, we invariably find him a cruel, ignorant savage. We find him but little better than a brute. Murderous wars, unbridled licentiousness, the immolation of human victims, slavery, cannibalism, exposures of all kinds, and in frequent instances death by starvation or suicide,—these are some of the continual, woful attendants of what is cried up to us as the state of nature. Let our modern advocates for such a state go and spend a few years with the savages in the interior of Africa, or in the fastnesses of New Zealand or New Holland, or in the deep recesses of our western woods, and the experiment, should they survive it, may perhaps cure them of their mania, and convince them that it is vain to look to *the state of nature* as a source of happiness.

Still another experiment which God was pleased to try in ancient times, and which seemed to promise most of all, was that of withdrawing his own people from the rest of the world, and organizing them as a community by themselves. Possibly this experiment began to be tried before the flood; for we read, in that age, of "the sons of God," as distinct from "the daughters of men." After the deluge, the ex-

periment was entered upon more effectually. When idolatry had begun to prevail extensively, and the knowledge of the true religion was likely to be lost, God called Abraham out of the land of his fathers, and brought him into Canaan, and instituted a church in his family, of which he was to be the visible head. He took this church into solemn covenant with himself; gave it new revelations, rites, and ordinances; and separated its members from the world around, that they might be a holy people unto the Lord. These transactions on the part of God were of solemn interest, and of the utmost importance to the world. Considered as a means of revealing the Savior to come, of keeping up a knowledge of him in the earth, and of drawing and binding sinful men to him, the only foundation of the sinner's hope, too much importance can not be attached to the church in the family of Abraham. But the members of this church came ere long to regard it, not as a means, but an end; not as a help to bring them upon the right foundation, and keep them there, but as itself the foundation. They came to *trust* to it, and to the privileges connected with it, as a ground of hope. "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are these." And now it became necessary for God to show them, by actual experiment, that they were trusting to a broken reed. Their church gradually became corrupt. It became so corrupt, that after repeated and long continued reproofs and corrections, after reforms and relapses, revivings and backslidings; the patience of God was exhausted with it, and the great body of its members went into utter and irretrievable apostasy. They were cut off and cast off for their unbelief; their holy city and temple were demolished; and all those things in which they vainly trusted and gloried were taken forever away.

All other experiments having been tried, and failed, the way was prepared, in the providence of God, for the grand source of light and hope to the world to be more fully exhibited. The true and only foundation, which had so long been typified and promised, was now to be laid. The great Son of God made his appearance in our flesh; he dwelt here on the earth a course of years; and having done and suffered all that had been written of him, he laid down his life a ransom for sinners. By his sufferings and blood he made a full and sufficient atonement for men; he laid a firm foundation of hope; and now all are invited to come and build upon it, and partake the provisions of his grace. "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters." "The spirit and the bride say, come; and let him that heareth say, come; and let him that is athirst, come; and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

When the invitations were first sounded forth, and set home by the power of the Holy Spirit, great multitudes at once embraced them. They came and builded on the sure foundation, and found life and peace. The word of the Lord had free course and was glorified. The church of Christ was rapidly increased, and the gospel of salvation was soon published throughout the greater part of the then civilized world.

When the corner stone of Zion had thus been laid, and men in such numbers had builded upon it, and found peace to their souls, it might have seemed that it could never be forsaken. The experience of past ages had shown the vanity of every other foundation; present experience was teaching the blessedness of this; and why should men any more stray away from the fountain of living waters, and hew out to themselves cisterns that could hold no water? Why should not all

come together to the feet of Christ, and learn experimentally the blessedness of those whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered?

Such may have been the reasonings of the recent converts, in that primitive, prosperous age of the church. Such may have been the expectations at that period indulged. It might have seemed as though the wanderings of restless man were over, and as though,—the great source of light and hope being found,—it would be forsaken no more forever.

But man's inveterate opposition to Christ and his gospel had not yet been fully exhibited. He had not yet ceased to pursue happiness where it never could be found, and in the search for it, to try experiments, and seek out inventions. The vain experiments which have been permitted and tried since the coming of Christ, and (what is stranger than all) within the pale of his own church, remain to be considered.

The first of these was that of *multiplied rites and forms*. The Christian rites, as instituted by our Savior and practiced by his apostles, are few, simple, and highly appropriate. They significantly set forth some of the more important truths or facts of the gospel, and seal and bind upon those who receive them, the obligations of the covenant of grace. But the apostles had not been long dead, when a disposition began to show itself to increase the ritual of our religion, and render it more acceptable to Jews and Pagans, by the addition of new ceremonies. And this course of things went steadily on, until both the nature and form of Christianity were entirely changed. Baptism soon came to be regarded as regeneration. It was that which cleansed the soul from sin. A rite of such momentous import must, of course, be preceded by a long process of preparatory observances. It must be ad-

ministered only on the great festival occasions, and under circumstances of profound secrecy and mystery. It must be followed, too, by a train of superstitious rites, such as the sign of the cross; the anointing with holy oil; the white robe, as a symbol of imparted purity; the crown of garlands, in token of victory; and the administration of milk and honey, to show that the subject of it had become spiritually a babe.

At the same time, or a little later, the Lord's Supper began to lose its commemorative character, and to be represented as a literal sacrifice of Christ. The elements, after consecration, were believed to be changed into his body and blood; of course, the administration of this ordinance became a scene of awful interest. The transmuted elements were reverently worshiped; they were trusted to as Christ; and the deluded votary, when he had received them, verily believed that he had received the Lord Jesus. And not only were the primitive sacraments of the New Testament obscured and perverted by superstitious rites, but new sacraments were invented, and new rites added, borrowed mostly from the Jewish and heathen temples, till, as we have said, both the nature and form of Christianity were changed, and the whole converted into another kind of religion, and another foundation of hope. The experiment of rites and forms was now complete, and the results of it were soon visible. It was found that the spirituality, the vitality of what was called the Christian religion was gone. It was no longer a pure fountain of living waters; an unfailing source of happiness to man. Its professors could no longer say with Paul: "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." The influence of the perverted system was rather to corrupt, than to purify; rather to perplex and distress the anxious soul,

than to fill it with light, and love, and joy.

The next experiment of the church, in its departure from Christ, was that of *strengthening its form of government*. The original form of church government was confessedly of a free, republican character. In the language of Waddington, an Episcopalian, "Every church," in the apostolic age, "was essentially independent of every other. The churches, thus constituted, formed a sort of federative body of independent religious communities, dispersed through the greater part of the Roman empire, in continual communication and in constant harmony with each other." Such was the form of church government, which the apostles, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, bequeathed to the churches. And this form of government was continued to them, during the period of their earliest and greatest prosperity. But as the life of religion began to decline, and a spirit of ambition and worldliness came to be exhibited, more especially in the higher ranks of the clergy, a desire was felt that the government of the church should be modified and strengthened, so as to place more power in the hands of its officers. And now there began to be a marked distinction between the bishop and the presbyter. And above the bishops, there soon came to be archbishops, metropolitans, exarchs, and patriarchs. And above them all towered, at length, the Pope of Rome. A great variety of inferior officers were also created, of which we hear nothing in the Scriptures, and for which there was no necessity, except in the pride of their superiors. Meanwhile, the individual churches were merged in great confederated communities, and their rights, liberties, and independence were swallowed up. This course of things went on, till more than half the churches in Christendom were united in one stupendous

hierarchy, over which presided, or rather reigned, the proud Bishop of Rome.

And what was the result of this grand experiment? Were the clergy more learned, holy, spiritual, faithful, as they rose in power? And were the churches better instructed, and better governed? Were they quickened and edified, and "walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost," were their numbers multiplied? No, but the very opposite of all this was the result. The clergy became worldly, aspiring, domineering, contentious. Their principal study was, not who should be the most eminent in wisdom, in grace, and in spiritual gifts, but who should be the greatest. The people were instructed, not in the holy truths and precepts of the gospel, but in the rites and forms,—the added ceremonies and superstitions of the church. Knowledge, of course, decayed; piety languished; while ignorance, error, and every form of corruption and wickedness prevailed. Such was the recorded result of the experiment now under consideration, showing that inventions and additions in the *government* of the church are no substitute for the light and influence of the gospel.

A third experiment tried in the church, in search of some other foundation of virtue and happiness aside from the gospel, was that of *monachism*. A considerable portion of the church, as early as the third and fourth centuries, worn out with persecutions, and tired of the corruptions prevailing in the world, determined to abandon it forever. They heard a voice crying to them: "Come out from the world, and be ye separate;" and this they understood in the literal sense. They retired, therefore, into deserts and solitary places, subsisting upon the barest necessities of life, and gave themselves up to indolence, seclusion, and contemplation. These

hordes of monastics were, after a time, formed into communities, and rules were given for their observance; rules which, it was believed, would prevent all disorders, and render the subjects of them holy and happy. This experiment was tried under different forms, and by vast multitudes of human beings, for a long course of years. Indeed, in some of its forms, it has continued to the present time. And what has been the almost invariable result of it? Has monachy secured to those who have practiced it, virtue and happiness? Has it been to them a source of peace? So far from this, in almost every case, it has proved a source of intolerable corruption. We would not say that there have been no pious monks. We would not say that the seclusion of monastic life has not been favorable, in some instances, to the promotion of piety. But this the voice of history constrains us to say, that the monastic establishments generally, have been the very hot-beds of vice, where corruption and wickedness, in their basest forms, have luxuriated. In some periods of the church, the monks have been among the vilest and most troublesome of men, the abhorrence of both kings and priests, and nuisances to the common people.

Averse to the method of salvation by Christ, men have tried the experiment, at different times, of *adulteration* and *perversion*; of *adding* something to the pure gospel, or of *taking something away*. Some new principle must be introduced, the better to solve a mystery, or explain a fact. Or some new observance or penance must be added, to render the foundation of hope the more secure. Or the morality of the gospel has been thought too severe, or too lax, and the standard must be made higher or lower, must be raised or depressed, to suit the prejudices and the fancies of men. Philosophy, too, has often thrust herself

ia, with her little rush light, to illumine the darkness of the sun, and make clear and palpable what the Bible had left obscure. It would be endless to refer to all the experiments of this kind which, during the last eighteen hundred years, have been successively tried in the church. But the issue, in all cases, has been much the same. The gospel has been perverted and corrupted, and the power of it has been turned away. The great source of light and hope has been removed, and a shadow has been substituted in its place. And it has mattered little as to the result, whether the adulteration took the form of an addition, or a subtraction. Those who have thought the standard of the gospel too low, and have wished to raise it, and those who have thought it too high, and have labored to depress it, have usually come together, in a little time. The extremes have met in the same result, and that has been one of delusion, corruption, and wickedness.

To make the experiment of departing from Christ appear the more hopeful, it has sometimes been introduced under the name and form of a *reformation*. A *real reformation*, if put in the place of Christ, and *trusted to* as a foundation of hope, will soon prove itself to be but a broken reed. This was painfully illustrated in the case of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Many of the reformed churches, when once they had escaped from the iron grasp of Popery, and found themselves out of the reach of their enemies, began to feel as though they had passed all dangers. Backsliding, degeneracy, errors in doctrine, and corruptions in practice, were scarcely feared; because they were regarded as scarcely possible. Christians *trusted to* the Reformation, and to its attendant blessings—their settled peace and their legal establishment—to secure them from all future ills, and make them happy.

Vol. VI.

66

And what was the consequence? A sad degeneracy ere long took place; contentions, errors, and backslidings were multiplied; and in less than two centuries, they needed another reformation to place them back upon the ground of the early reformers.

But most of the alleged reformations in the church of Christ have not been real. They have been the work of furious and half-crazed fanatics, or of dreamy mystics, who, in the effort to improve upon the work of the Savior, have perverted and polluted all that their hands have touched. Such was the pretended reformation under Montanus, in the second century; and that under Manes, in the third; both of whom professed to be the promised Comforter from heaven, and to have a commission to reform the religion of Christ. Such, too, was the reformation attempted by the fanatics in the sixteenth century, who denounced Luther as not worthy the name of a reformer, and undertook to carry forward his half-way measures to perfection. And such, it may be feared, are not a few of the misnamed reformations of the present day. No movement of this kind, whether social, political, or moral, which virtually sets aside the gospel,—which professes to improve upon it, to go beyond it, or to proceed without it, can long prosper. It is sure to terminate in corruption and defeat, and to involve its abettors, sooner or later, in shame and ruin.

Were we to speak of other experiments which have been tried in the church of Christ, we should notice those growing out of a *carnal, worldly policy*. There have been those in past ages—there are some such now—who, not content with promoting a holy, spiritual cause, by holy and spiritual means, have been inclined to resort to other measures. Some have used flattery, and some force. Motives of self-interest or

ambition have been employed, and a worldly expediency has been substituted in place of duty. With a view to the more rapid increase of numbers, some have been willing to conceal or soften the more offensive points of the gospel; to lower its high and uncompromising claims; or to throw open the doors of the church a little wider than our Savior supposed would be consistent with its safety. But facts have long ago demonstrated that all such expedients are a great deal worse than fruitless. They are positively sinful, corrupting and dangerous. They draw away the church from Christ, and place it on another foundation; and the first storm that blows is sufficient to show that this new foundation is all sand.

The foregoing discussion is intended to teach us, and to impress upon us, several lessons. And, first, the connexion of God's great work of *providence*, as recorded, in part, on the page of history, with his greater work of *redemption*, as unfolded in the gospel. To the casual observer of providence—to the ordinary reader of this world's history, the whole appears like a chaos of incidents, no thread, no system, no line of connexion running through it. One course of events is seen here, and another there. Some nations become civilized and refined, while others are left to their native barbarism. Kingdoms rise upon the stage, one after another, and become great and powerful, and then pass away and are forgotten. And the history of the church seems scarcely less a chaos, than that of the world. Changes are continually going on within it, and around it, and these, apparently, without much order. New doctrines or measures are introduced, and then laid aside. Heresies make their appearance, and have their advocates, and after a while are refuted, and die away. Now the church is protected, and now persecuted. There are reviv-

ings and backslidings; seasons of light and hope, and then of darkness. Such, we say, is the *appearance* to the casual observer of providence, and to the ordinary, though it may be extensive, reader of history.

But the intelligent Christian, with his Bible open before him, and his heart warmed with the great subject of redemption, studies the book of providence, and reads history, with other eyes. He learns from his Bible, that as all things were made by Christ, so they were all made *for* him; that "he is head over all things to the church;" and that he overrules all things in providence, with a view to the great purposes of redemption. In the Bible, redemption is presented as the *great* work of God; that which was performed at the greatest expense to himself; that which is best calculated to show forth his glory. The creation of this world was but a scaffolding, on which the greater work of redemption was to be performed; and the entire work of providence in respect to this world—the changes and revolutions which take place among men,—the rise and fall of states and empires,—these all are in some way connected with, and subsidiary to, the great purposes of redeeming mercy.

Having gained these important intimations from the Bible, the Christian student now looks out upon the world, and back upon the wide field of its history; and what before seemed so chaotic and disordered, puts on the appearance of system and form. A strong line of connexion is seen running through it; a unity of object is discovered; and *redemption* is seen to be the central point, towards which every thing tends, and for which all exist. In the death of his beloved Son, God has opened a way of life and salvation for ruined man. He has laid a foundation of hope for the world. It is a *sure* foundation; it is the *only* foundation. And this point God is continually and variously illustrating

in his providence. The foregoing remarks teach us *how* he illustrates it. It is by an endless succession of experiments. God is showing his creatures, not only in his word, but by the events of his providence, —by actual and oft repeated *experiments*, taking place before their eyes, that the *gospel* is the only source of real blessing to them, and that if they would be happy, they must put their trust in Christ alone. Some of these experiments we have already considered; and the making of them, and of others like them, has *filled up*, to a great extent, the history both of the church and world. The entire history of the past is little more than a history of these various experiments, all standing connected with the great subject of redemption, and all calculated and intended—if men could but see it—to call them back from the vain search after happiness, and bring them to trust in Christ alone.

President Edwards commenced an extended history of the church, and entitled it "A History of Redemption." In a more enlarged sense, the same title might be given to a full history of the world. It is all a *history of redemption*. Not that every thing which has taken place on earth has been of a directly religious character; far from it. But every thing has stood connected, in some way, with redemption. Every thing has had a bearing on this mighty subject. Even in those parts of the earth where Christ is not named, and his religion is not known, the providence of God has been silently, secretly at work, in subserviency to the designs of redeeming mercy. An experiment has been going on there, which is already of great value to the church and world, showing the hopeless misery of departing from God, and losing the knowledge of his salvation. It is in its connexion with redemption, that we must come to look at the history of the world, if

we would regard it as God does, or if we would be greatly interested and instructed by it.

The second lesson which the subject is fitted to impress upon us, is the importance of that first principle of Protestantism,—*the Bible the only rule of faith and practice*. This implies, that when the canon of Scripture is once settled, and the meaning of it ascertained, there be no more questions asked respecting it. We are to rest in the decisions of God's holy word,—desiring neither to rise above it, nor to fall below it; neither to add to it, nor take from it.

The great Protestant principle as to the sufficiency of Scripture has been violated in several ways, and by very different classes of persons. It has been violated by Tractarians, Romanists, and all those other sects, who would connect with the Bible, and receive as a part of their rule of faith, the traditions of the elders, and canons of the church. It has been violated by fanatics, mystics, and impostors, who have made pretences to inspiration, and have substituted their own dreams and fancies in place of the revelations of God. It has been violated by liberalists of various names, who, dissatisfied with much that the Bible contains, have undertaken, by dint of criticism and false interpretation, to cut it down, or explain it away, till nothing is left which offends the proud and selfish heart. But in whatever direction, or by whatever means, the great principle before us has been invaded, the flood-gates of corruption have been invariably opened, through which streams of error and wickedness have poured, to desolate the vineyard of the Lord. Nearly all those vain and wicked experiments which have been made in Christendom during the last eighteen hundred years, and in the making of which the church has been corrupted and wasted, have come in upon it in this way. They could

have come in no other. If the Bible had been uniformly and consistently adhered to, as the only rule of faith and practice, those long ages of delusion and darkness, so painful to the eye and the heart of benevolence, had never been: The church had been comparatively pure, and the world had been blessed.

But the great lesson which this subject is fitted to teach and impress, is that with which the discussion commenced. *The Gospel the grand remedy for human woes, and the only source of real blessing to the world.* "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is *Jesus Christ.*" Of all lessons, divine or human, this is infinitely the most important to be learned. It is the lesson which, of all others, God has been at the most pains to teach us. And yet it is that to which we are naturally the most averse. We turn every way, before we

come to Christ. We try every other foundation, before we consent to build upon Christ alone. The world's history is filled up with vain and fruitless experiments, in the search after happiness; nor is the heart of restless man weaned from them even now. He is as much inclined as ever to forsake the fountain of living waters, and hew out for himself cisterns which can hold no water.

How long is this miserable course of things to continue? When shall it have an end? Is it not time, even now, that we commence learning the lessons of heavenly wisdom? Is it not time that we listen to the voice of our Heavenly Father, crying to us, not only from the pages of his word, but from every leaf and line of the great book of his providence, and saying: *None but Christ. Nothing but Christ. Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.*

---

#### OUR LATE CONQUESTS.

BAYONETS and cannon-balls have disclosed a new and distinct era in our history. Fifteen years ago, Mexico afforded no prospect of game to a far-sighted and a strong falcon, except some covetous vision of that sort may have flitted across the mind of some of the chivalry of the South. Within that time poor Mexico's history has been unravelled from the web of destiny in galloping haste, and she now finds herself a helpless quarry, with the falcon upon her, and barely saving her life by the most humiliating concessions. Her armies, although nerved with desperation, have fled before the Saxons; her best leaders have furnished no charm to dispel the fatal spell ruining her, and even the strong holds nature gave her for defense, have played her false. At every point defeated, the sacred city of her

kings penetrated by the enemy, and her government reduced by desperation from driveling imbecility to a "bedizened nothing," these constitute briefly the elements of a "conquered peace," as Coleridge would have termed it. From the first, predictions were made concerning the intentions of our government, of such an incredible nature, that most minds revolted from them. Some predicted that Mexico would be forced at the point of the bayonet to yield up all claim to Texas, not only to the Nueces river, but to the Rio del Norte, and they regarded this consummation of annexation in a legal title, written though it might be in blood, as the extreme of intention on the part of our government! But the idea of making, by the same laudable means, the Rio del Norte a boundary between the two coun-

tries, then boldly leaving that to swallow up New Mexico, and then rushing westwardly to the Pacific to do the same office for California, never entered many minds, except the privileged behind the curtain! And yet it has been done. Palo Alto, Resaca de la Palma, Buena Vista, Monterey, Vera Cruz, Cerro Gordo, Cherubusco, and Mexico, have all become words to us as noted as Austerlitz, Friedland, and Wagram, words indicative of a victorious but bloody march to complete conquest. For our part, we must confess, when we looked back over some modern scenes in American history, as connected with the barbarous extermination or removal of Indians from their own lands, we felt the greatest confidence possible in the elasticity and capacity of the governmental conscience. Long before Scott took the field and consummated what Taylor had begun, we had written concerning our greediness for conquest. "These facts are palpable, and they are written in blood. Our government is possessed by a mania for more territory, and does not scruple to seize it at the cost of war. The conquest of New Mexico and California has become common talk. No one questions the toughness of the governmental conscience. That conscience hitherto has proved itself as elastic as the stomach of a boa-constrictor. It can swallow whole territories to which it has no more right than to London or to Paris, without a grimace of pain. How absurd to talk of tenderness of conscience in a government whose rapacity for conquest is only equalled by that of England!"

Without referring to some ridiculous facts, which quarrels among the principal actors have brought to light, it is sufficient to state that a treaty was signed by Nicholas P. Trist on the part of the United States, and three commissioners on the part of Mexico, and this treaty

has been sanctioned by the two governments. Our flag was floating over the "Halls of the Montezumas," and had been flung to the breeze from the loftiest peaks of the Cordilleras. Mexico was at our feet, and we of course dictated our own terms. By these terms, Texas, as far west as the Rio del Norte, becomes ours; the entire Province of New Mexico, and the territory north of the river Gila, and a line which divides Upper and Lower California, is also ceded to us, making an area of "seven hundred miles north and south, and nine hundred miles east and west." Our late conquests, absolved from crime by treaty,

*"Stuffed out with big preamble, holy names,  
And adjurations of the God in Heaven,"*

amount to the comfortable surface of six hundred and thirty thousand square miles, which will sound more significantly when we say it is an area almost equal to that occupied by Great Britain and Ireland, France, Spain, Portugal, and Prussia. With Texas, it is more than half of the original territory of Mexico. Or, to make it still more familiar and formidable, its area is sufficient for sixteen states as large as Ohio!

With this general indication of the extent of our conquests, it becomes a matter of importance to ascertain, as far as possible, the character of this immense territory. What are its resources and its present condition? What is the value, now and prospectively, of a territory for which all acknowledge we have paid a great price? If this country contains sixteen states like Ohio, with her amazing fertility, and resources, which are likely to be developed at some future time, then we may be accredited before the world as sa-gacious in our greediness to gain it. Or if there are hordes of ignorant barbarians, lorded over by nabobs of uncounted wealth, from whom the thumb screws of avarice may extort such compensation as

England has wrung from the East Indies, we may be applauded by that morality which savors as little as possible of God, and much as possible of Mammon.

An accurate examination of all the reliable authorities will satisfactorily prove, that our good lands are not limited by the present advances of civilization. The United States territory west of civilization and east of the Rocky Mountains, is about eight hundred miles long by five hundred broad, and is intersected by vast rivers, which, with their tributaries, make an aggregate length of twenty thousand miles. Those rivers are bordered with productive lands, nor are all the uplands barren wastes. When we remember that in this very territory are sustained those herds of buffalo, so vast as literally to be computed by the square mile, we must be convinced that it is not a vast sand barren. A gentleman connected long with the fur trade, computes the number of buffaloes killed between the years 1833 and 1843, at near three millions. And yet in spite of the wonderful slaughter which is constantly going on, Fremont, Emory, and others, can not repress their astonishment at the limitless herds which still are sustained in full-fed plenty on these plains. We have no doubt there is a large quantity of good land on the territory west of us along the Arkansas, Kansas, Platte, and Yellow Stone rivers and their tributaries.

But as we bend our course in a southeast direction along the course of the Santa Fe traders, we shall find the country rougher, and the resources for sustaining population less than farther north. Bent's Fort, on the Arkansas River, is the point where travelers commence the real difficulties of their journey. In common seasons they have no great difficulty in procuring food for their caravan. Lieut. Emory, in his journal, under date of August 7th, six days' marches from Bent's Fort, has

the following passage, which speaks for itself: "We are now in what may be called the paradise of that part of the country between Bent's Fort and San Miguel; and yet he who leaves the edge of the Canadian, or its tributaries, must make a good day's march to find food, water, or grass." And such was the straitness of their situation in this "paradise," that Emory tells us, under the same date, that they were compelled to stint the men in their rations of bread. While here, he is not enraptured with a sight of buffaloes as he was farther north; and the inference is, that the natural instinct of this animal leads him away from a country unproductive of sustenance for him. By this we do not assert the entire country to be thus, but that in general such is its character. The attempt to rear up a second buckeye state *there* would be as hopeless a task—to use Kirwan's expression—as to "bleed a tombstone."

Some investigation leads us to conclude such to be the general character of the province of New Mexico, which is half as large again as Ohio. The value of this conquest may be ascertained with some degree of accuracy, and in doing this, we shall rely principally on the authority of persons in some way attached to the government. It would be expected of them to give as favorable an account of this country as would be consistent with facts. Lieut. Emory, and Dr. Wislizenus, have prepared narrations of their researches in New Mexico. The Senate have caused these to be printed, and from these and Humboldt's researches into New Spain, we derive our principal facts. Concerning the apparent honesty and ability of these witnesses, we can speak without hesitation. They seem to speak not as packed jurors, but as honest men.

Humboldt gives the following unpromising account of New Mexico: its latitude the same with that of

**Syria and Central Persia**; its climate is so cold that it freezes there in the middle of May. He asserts one desert of considerable width to be about one hundred miles in length, an area given up to sterility, which would immensely diminish the capacities of the buckeye state, were it there. And, moreover, he declares the whole country, in general, to be seldom visited by rains, and of course very barren. For this reason, nature forbids the possibility of a large population ever being sustained in this province. On the Rio del Norte there are some productive lands, and yet such perpetual aridity prevails, that even these are useless without artificial irrigation. From some singular facts which this enterprising traveler has given, we infer the country to be subject, occasionally at least, to earthquakes; which, in two instances at least, for a considerable time, interrupted the natural course of the Del Norte. His account of the population, is equally unpromising, as may be inferred from this glance at their commerce in 1802. When the natives wish to trade with the Spanish colonists, they plant, as a sign of good faith, a cross by the road side, to which they suspend a leather bag, with a piece of stag flesh, while at the foot of the cross they stretch out a buffalo hide. This truly primitive procedure is understood by the colonist, who takes away the hide and leaves in its place such articles as he knows the Indian wants! He speaks also of the distrust which exists between the colonists and natives, resulting in frequent murders, and, as we learn from another source, in one instance, the massacre of all the whites in the province. This was in 1680, and yet the same author declares that the "deep rancor of the Indian race has continued to the present time, and in all the frequent and bloody revolutions of later years in New Mexico, the pueblos have generally acted a conspicuous and

erful part."<sup>12</sup> Humboldt notices a fact, which has not changed since he wrote, that this hatred between the two races has caused the population to concentrate in towns, instead of spreading over the country. In his day the principal towns, Santa Fé, Albuquerque, and Taos, had only small populations severally. According to Humboldt, Santa Fé had near four thousand, but modern travelers put it at three thousand.<sup>13</sup>

The general accounts of Emory and Wislizenus, published during the present year by order of the Senate, do not differ materially from that condensed from Humboldt. They give the country around Santa Fé a little more credit than Humboldt, who declares the soil to be very dry and sandy, and yet we receive far more unfavorable accounts of New Mexico from these works. There are many incidental expressions, such as drop from honest witnesses, which are as satisfactory as labored description. Emory traversed New Mexico from northeast to southwest, in a line acknowledged to be the best in the province. In one place, speaking of the country as a whole, he begins a sentence thus, "New Mexico, although its soil is barren and its resources limited, etc."<sup>14</sup> On the next page he speaks of striking across "a dry, arid plain." From where he crossed the Galisteo creek to its mouth, a distance of some twenty miles, he says "there is scarcely a sign of vegetation." Even in the valley of the Del Norte between San Felipe and the Angosturas, the valley is so narrow as to forbid much agriculture, whilst the plains above are "rolling sand-hills rising gradually to the base of the mountain."<sup>15</sup> From this wide sweep of sterility, he excepts the "poverty-stricken little

<sup>12</sup> Report of Dr. Wislizenus, published by the Senate of the United States in 1848.

<sup>13</sup> Humboldt's New Spain, vol. 2.

<sup>14</sup> Emory's New Mexico, p. 35.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. p. 39.

town of Algedones, which has some ground around it in cultivation." Still following the course of the Del Norte, he says, "the valley suddenly contracts below Perdilla, between Isollatta and Peralta. On the east side of the river there is deep sand, and the country is perfectly barren." Under date of September 7th, on the same page as the last quotation, he says, "nearly the whole distance traveled in the last three days has been over drifting sand, with only occasionally patches of firm soil."\* On pages 47, 49 and 51, containing his journal for some six days, he speaks of the "rolling sand-hills" and plains over which he passed. He makes some exceptions in favor of the country around Santa Fé, Passo Del Norte, and other places, which are to the country at large as mere garden patches.

Dr. Wislizenus asserts New Mexico to be a "very mountainous country," intersected by the valley of the Del Norte, which contains almost all the good land in the province; and even the soil of this valley is "generally sandy and looks poor," and produces crops on no condition without irrigation. We might verify our estimate of this province by the same method which we have already taken with Emory's report. Incidental allusions all tend to the same point, that New Mexico has the most meager capacities to sustain population. A single county in Ohio or Wisconsin will sustain bountifully more people than all the 60,000 square miles of New Mexico together!

As to its mineral wealth, the accounts are confused and uncertain, and it is not very probable that in this respect the United States have entered into a very profitable speculation. Its only importance is in a military point of view, to keep open a passage to California, which may at least become the connecting link

of the immense trade between Eastern Asia and our country.

The present population is estimated at from 80,000 to 100,000, but such a population as it is! Should any one wish to know who are our new fellow citizens, we beg them forthwith to procure the journals of Emory and Wislizenus, and to re-read Humboldt's *New Spain*. Spaniards, half-breeds and natives, some Catholics and some heathen, and the most of them depraved, treacherous and beastly. Such are the acquisitions we have made by conquest. Agriculture is yet confined to men scratching the soil with a hoe. Commerce, as we have seen, is truly primitive; their mankind abominably lazy, and their woman-kind sufficiently refined to ride horses astride. Wagons, such as they make, would have shocked the taste of an ancient Helot. Their most perfected machinery consists in a rude grist-mill propelled by mules, and their greatest mental acumen consists in practically knowing that "the galled jade will wince," since they think themselves highly favored in a riding horse or pack mule, which may happen to have a galled shoulder or back, on which to apply the goad! We wait in calm expectancy of the time when the newly admitted State of New Mexico shall furnish her representative and two Senators. Perhaps one of the last shall be the *Alcalde* of *Vegas*, whom Emory so jocosely describes, and to whom Gen. Kearney said so cleverly—"Mr. *Alcalde*, and people of New Mexico: I have come amongst you by the orders of my government, to take possession of your country, and extend over it the laws of the United States! We consider it, and have done so for some time, a part of the territory of the United States! We come among you as friends, not as enemies; as protectors, not as conquerors!" Then came the *absolution* which General Kearney administered, equal to ex-

\* Emory's *New Mexico*, p. 41.

treme unction from the hands of Bishop Hughes; but Mr. Alcalde was not willing to be absolved from his sworn allegiance to Mexico, and he made horrible grimaces while the General was administering on him, and cast down his eyes, and sought escape. But there was no escape, and the General made Mr. Alcalde look up into his eyes, (as we were wont in our younger days to chuckle sulky boys under the chin,) and repeat after him, the oath of eternal allegiance to the United States!

What an admirable shade will this portrait of the former "Mr. Alcalde" of Vegas, but now—in prospect—Senator elect from New Mexico, make in some grand picture of the United States Senate. We can almost imagine how his bronzed visage will look, sitting—as he ought in all conscience—between Senator Calhoun of South Carolina, and Senator Houston of Texas! We feel great exhilaration as we take wings and look a little into the future. Ah, certainly our far-sighted statesmen, consummating this business, deserve a monument to eternize the country's gratitude to them for their chivalrous deeds in annexing New Mexico to the United States.

We did intend to pen a paragraph on the singular and summary annexation of New Mexico to our territory by Gen. Kearney, but our limits forbid it, and we must content ourselves with referring our reader to the fifth chapter of Mansfield's History of the Mexican War, where the unparalleled assumption of this military chieftain is well set forth and rebuked. But when our highest officer can deliberately pen such words as these in a message to Congress, the Mexican government has "at last invaded our territory and shed the blood of our fellow citizens on our own soil," as baseless an assertion as ever was uttered, what may we not forgive in a subordinate of his in New Mexico?

VOL. VI.

67

We wish now to examine the character of the remaining conquest, which for brevity we call California, meaning by that all the territory gained from Mexico by the late treaty not included in New Mexico. The treaty defines the boundary line as leaving that of New Mexico on the west, where it intersects the first branch of the river Gila, which is about at the  $33^{\circ}$  of north latitude. Thence it follows the Gila to its junction with the Colorado, and thence it crosses the Colorado, following the common division line between Upper and Lower California to the Pacific Ocean. The average width of this belt of land is not far from ten degrees, extending of course up to the  $42^{\circ}$  of latitude, the old boundary between the two countries. At an average distance of about 150 miles from the shore of the Pacific is the Sierra Nevada, the Snowy Mountain, dividing California proper, from a vast tract of country lying east of that mountain. It will convey more distinct impressions concerning this recent fruit of "conquered peace," to consider these two sections of country separately, and that section lying east of the Sierra Nevada will properly come first. At the very outset we may express our regret at not being able to secure a copy of Fremont's map, now in course of publication, giving no doubt the most accurate position to some marked features in that district. We are obliged to make our deductions from the incomplete map of Emory, and some maps in common use.

From the reports of Emory and Fremont, we shall derive our principal description of this country. It may be reckoned at about twelve degrees east and west, that is more than seven hundred miles. There are many allusions in these journals, as well as in some others, which will convey a very vivid impression to the mind. Lieut. Emory, after leaving New Mexico, followed the Gila

to its junction with the Colorado, and then bore in a northwest direction to California. That there is but little difference between this country and that we have already described, is evident from following him in his weary march over so many leagues of mountain and desert, at the expense of many of his animals. About two degrees due west from New Mexico, "the general character of the country is much as before represented." Some sixty miles more the plain furnished them "dust knee deep, a good looking soil, but *for whole acres not a sign of vegetation.*" Irrigation might redeem this plain, and this must be done if it is ever cultivated. The country as he proceeded became more and more mountainous, and at last the valley of the Gila became so narrow and rough that he was obliged to leave that and strike boldly across the highlands. Occasionally he comes to a fertile valley, like that of the San Pedro, and particular parts of the Gila; but for the rest its breast is rough and fissured, or if not so, covered with barren sands, precluding the hope of reward to the agriculturalist. They finally leave the mountains, but the plains were more inhospitable, and the horses seemed about to starve for want of grass, which was found in very small quantities. At one place the party were regaled with the pleasant prospect of three hundred miles to be passed without an adequate supply for their animals, and anticipation became reality, since Emory speaks of the sterile country as being "dreary beyond description," and "the table lands formed of sand."

There were some patches of arable land found during these marches, but when at last they reached the Colorado, they had a desert of ninety miles before them, without water or grass except in the smallest quantity. They suffered greatly in crossing this, and lost many of their animals. Emory describes

this desert as a triangle bounded by the Colorado on one side, the Snowy Mountains on another, and on a third, by still another chain of mountains. "It is covered chiefly with floating sand." During the marches over this desert, containing some three thousand five hundred square miles, they found only two patches of grass. That desert, forming a part of our prize, is about three times as large as Rhode Island, and is half as large as New Jersey! which comparison is significant of "value received!"

Lieut. Emory has made some general remarks concerning the territory we are now describing, so pertinent, that we will transfer them to our pages, that "the chivalry," panting for ways and means to get clear of slaves to the best advantage, may see clearly their prospects in New Mexico, and California east of the Sierra Nevada.

"The country from the Arkansas to this point," he writes at the mouth of the Gila, "more than twelve hundred miles, in its adaptation to agriculture, has peculiarities, which must forever stamp itself upon the population which inhabits it. All of North Mexico, embracing New Mexico, Chihuahua, Sonora and THE CALIFORNIAS, as far north as the Sacramento, are, as far as the best information goes, the same in the physical character of its surface, and differ but little in climate or products.

"In no part of this vast tract can the rains from heaven be relied on, to any extent, for the cultivation of the soil. The earth is destitute of trees, and in great part also of any vegetation whatever.

"A few feeble streams flow in different directions from the great mountains, which in many places traverse this region. These streams are separated, sometimes by plains, and sometimes by mountains, without water and without vegetation, and may be called deserts, so far as

they perform any useful part in the sustenance of animal life.

"The cultivation of the earth, therefore, is confined to those narrow strips of land which are within the level of the waters of the streams, and wherever practiced in a community with any success, or to any extent, involves a degree of subordination and absolute obedience to a chief, repugnant to the habits of our people. The chief who directs the time and quantity of the precious irrigating water, must be obeyed implicitly by the whole community. A departure from his orders, by a waste of water, or unjust distribution of it, or neglect to make proper embankments, may endanger the means of subsistence of many people. He must therefore be armed with power to punish promptly and immediately.

"The profits of labor are too inadequate for the existence of negro slavery. Slavery as practiced by the Mexicans, under the form of peonage, which enables the master to get the services of the adult while in the prime of life, without the obligation of rearing him in infancy, supporting him in old age, or maintaining his family, affords no data for estimating the profits of slave labor, as it exists in the United States. No one who has ever visited this country, and who is acquainted with the character and value of slave labor in the United States, would ever think of bringing his own slaves here with any view to profit; much less would he purchase slaves for such a purpose. Their labor here, if they could be retained as slaves, among peons, nearly of their own color, would never pay the cost of transportation, much less the additional purchase money."<sup>\*</sup>

Our readers will remember that we have thus passed along the southern border of our new territory as far as the Snowy Mountain; and we

are content to allow these facts to speak for themselves, while we examine briefly another feature of the same district, without which our view would be very imperfect. By examining any map of ordinary accuracy, we find in this district of country, what Fremont calls the Great Basin. With the map of this enterprising traveler we could define more accurately the boundaries of this singular and isolated region; and in the want of that, must content ourselves with such authorities as are within our reach. On most maps for want of better knowledge, it is put down as the Great Sandy Desert, and until Fremont's partial exploration its real character was unknown. This traveler has twice visited it, and yet in his last report addressed to the Senate, he speaks of it as "deserving the full examination of a thorough exploration." Fremont says explicitly that it is "a basin of some five hundred miles in diameter every way, between four and five thousand feet above the level of the sea, shut in all around by mountains, with its own system of lakes and rivers, and having no connexion whatever with the sea."<sup>†</sup> Here then we have in this basin and its broad rim of mountains between two and three hundred thousand square miles, which is about one third of the entire conquest. Fremont proves that it is not given up entirely to sterility. "Mountain is the predominating structure of the interior of the basin," and "its general character, with exceptions, is that of desert. The plains are sandy and barren. The bases of the mountain have a "belt of alluvial soil," and that with considerable uniformity. The basin has two large lakes, the one salt, and the other fresh; and "on the east of these, along the base of the mountains, is the usual bench of alluvion, which extends to a distance of three hundred

\* Emory's New Mexico, p. 98.

† Fremont's Geog. Memoir, p. 7.

miles, with wood, water, and abundant grass."\* The salt lake is about seventy miles long, and the Utah about half that. On this bench of land the Mormons have already begun a settlement, and made such headway, that "on the 1st of April of the present year they had three thousand acres of wheat, seven saw and grist mills, seven hundred houses in a fortified enclosure of sixty acres, stock and other accompaniments of a flourishing settlement." The climate of the Basin is said to be excellent, and the rains generally sufficient for the purposes of agriculture.

And yet these documents, published by the Senate of the United States, declare the greater portion of this third part of their conquest to be a useless desert, having the smallest capacities for furnishing necessary subsistence for population. Probably a dozen counties in the buck-eye state actually have more acres of arable land than this immense acquisition east of the Sierra Nevada. We have mountains and plains of rolling sand-hills, interspersed with here and there a patch of ground which has a soil sufficient for agriculture; and even here, in the majority of cases, the streams must be dammed for irrigation, as an indispensable condition. Were the twenty-five thousand men alive, whose lives this iniquitous war has cost the United States, the territory—aside from Upper California proper—bought with their blood, would hardly furnish a sufficiency of productive land to give each of them a quarter of a section! We have not done so well as old England in her Asiatic iniquities, drinking up

—“demeur as at a grace,  
Pollutions from the brimming cup of wealth;  
Contempts of all honorable rule,  
Yet bartering freedom and the poor man's life  
For gold as at a market!”

Here is the prize we gain in a war originating in the greed for new ter-

ritory on which to plant and extend slavery; a war costing the poor man's life with a multiplication truly frightful. Our pollutions are not drank from the brimming cup of wealth to constitute their apology. And as we glance over the bulk of our acquisitions already described, we are almost maliciously reminded by some scoundrel-whisperer at our ear, of a scene in Milton, “a grove hard by,” “laden with fair fruit.”

“—— On that prospect strange  
Their earnest eyes they fixed”——  
“ Yet parched with scalding thirst and hunger  
fierce,”

“ greedily they plucked  
The fruitage fair to sight, like that which grew  
Near that bituminous lake where Sodom  
flamed;  
This more delusive, not the touch, but taste  
Deceived; they fondly thinking to allay  
Their appetite with gust, instead of fruit  
Chewed bitter ashes, which the offended taste  
With spattering noise rejected !”

The hand of Providence has held the balance here, and while she held has flung such a mist before the eyes of the rapacious barterers in this bargain, that they fancied this immense territory of desert to be an Eden of such unrivalled fertility, that all the south might see herself more than reproduced in new slave states.

A few more words and we have done. The only redeeming feature of this hard bargain, is found in that part of Upper California which lies between the Sierra Nevada and the Pacific coast, and as this part of the territory is better understood than the rest, we shall be as brief as possible concerning it. In round numbers, this district contains between seventy-five thousand and one hundred thousand square miles; that is, it includes territory equal to nearly twice that of Ohio or New York. Humboldt says it is one of the most beautiful countries in the world. The valleys of the American, the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, are very fertile. Fremont, in order to reach the Arkansas, was compelled to follow the San Joaquin

\* Fremont's Geog. Memoir, p. 8.

some distance, and keep the rocky rampart of Sierra Nevada on his left, some five hundred miles, in order to find a pass over them. This made the journey to the Arkansas two thousand miles, which, in due east course, was about nine hundred miles. During that journey, even in California, he found many sandy and barren plains, proving the country not to be altogether so many square miles of fertility. Facts will prove that many leagues of worthless land mar the excellence of this country. For instance, Fremont says that the extensive valley of the San Joaquin "presents every variety of soil, from dry and unproductive to well watered and luxuriantly fertile." Besides these sterile tracts in the level country, we must also subtract the broad and rocky slopes of the mountains which hem it in its whole length. The climate is remarkably fine, if we except the single drawback on the highest capabilities for agriculture, its tendency to aridity. It is not so faulty in this respect as Lower California, and the country east of the mountains already described. Yet the agriculturalist can not rely with any degree of certainty on the rains of heaven. To be above the fear of drought, he must irrigate, for which there are facilities in many parts of the territory.

Our government, no doubt, attaches the highest importance to the bays and harbors, which are said to be very capacious and safe. Of these the public are sufficiently informed already, and of their prospective importance in the trade with Eastern Asia. The day when this shall be the case is too remote to call for remark here. Until a railroad can be constructed across the continent, these harbors will not be of much service in that trade, and such obstacles exist to a project of this kind, that it may reasonably be doubted whether even America's enterprise will dare to grapple with them for a long time to come. Nature has lifted

ramparts of rock heaven-high between us and California, which we do not say may not yet be hewn down, but which we do believe will long remain untouched. And before any such scheme can be available or permanent, the savages must be civilized, or removed, or exterminated; but judging from the history of the savages, as seen in our slave states, this last would be the smallest of obstacles, and easily shoved aside.

And now, glancing at the country over which we have passed so rapidly, searching twelve hundred miles from the head-waters of the Arkansas before we found a country which at all deserves the name of being productive and valuable, who of us believes that California on the Pacific, cut off from our remotest settlements by a vast desert, and broad, high mountains, can be bound long to Washington as a center? Let it grow and become important, in a section of the world where its habits and interests will be peculiar to itself, separated by a journey of three thousand miles from the center of power, who believes such a prize will long stay in our grasp? Indeed, as we have looked at the subject of American conquests, we have thought of a fear which was once expressed by sea-faring men concerning that huge iron steamer, the Great Britain, that her length was so great that she was liable to break in two on the back of some high wave, or with her stern on one wave and stem on another, with her center unsupported, she might go to pieces by her own weight. Is there no danger of the same sort to our country, reaching now from Maine to California, a huge, weary length? Should there come some such a storm as the rabid nullificationists of the South are threatening, we confess to the painful fear, that on the back of that wave we should break in two. Or should the ill-fated vessel rest on two mountain waves,

one stirred by freedom, the other by slavery, we should tremble lest she should fall to pieces by her own unwieldy weight!

Such are our prospects in California, and such the fears to which this base war has made us heirs—a war conceived in sin, and brought forth in iniquity—a war commenced for the extension of slavery, and costing us, who abhor such a result as we do death, TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND MEN, AND ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SIX MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, BESIDES

THE IMMENSE BURDENS SADDLED ON US BY THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS. But if our deductions prove not false concerning the utter unfitness of these conquests for the purposes they were intended to subserve, we thank Him, whose power has been displayed sublimely in heaving up these mountains into such a rugged and unproductive confusion, as shall forever banish from this territory a system which traffics in the image of God, and whose presence, anywhere, is an unmitigated curse.

#### THE ETHICS OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY.

THAT the baneful effects of religious controversy far exceed the good effects, and that it deserves for this reason to be discountenanced by the friends of truth, is a very prevalent opinion. These evils are indisputably very great, and very much to be deplored. Controversy often results in the lasting alienation of Christians from each other, not only of the immediate disputants, but of all who take sides with them. The more remote effect upon the world is perhaps an evil of still greater magnitude. It is questionable whether there is any other objection to Christianity which has so much influence in strengthening unbelief, as the controversies of the church. The unfairness and bitterness of these conflicts bring Christianity itself into doubt, and the doctrines contended for, often the most essential parts of the system, into undeserved odium. Nor are the true ends of controversy very frequently attained as a compensation for these terrible evils of the conflict. The errorist, who, if he had been left to his own reflections and studies, or to the silent influence of time, might have come to the light, is hopelessly wedded by controversy to his own opinions, at least forever

set against the faith of his opponent. Nor does the cause of truth always come out of these conflicts unharmed. After the smoke and dust of battle have passed away, we discover that the victory has not been won without a fearful sacrifice, and it is often quite doubtful whether, after all, the advantage is on the side of truth. Bad results are sufficiently apparent, but the good contended for, the refutation of error, and the establishment of truth in the convictions of men, is not so manifestly attained.

What shall we, then, say of the defenders of orthodoxy in the Christian church? Shall we deny their title to gratitude? Shall we say that the peace and purity of the church are not indebted to their labors? Shall we frown upon all controversy among Christians?

We might, perhaps, be driven to this extreme, if we were forced to take the controversies of the church, as they have been for the most part conducted, as a type of what they are by necessity. The unchristian manner in which religious controversies have generally been carried on, has given them, by way of eminence, the name of *polemics*; as at the first the Apostle James denomi-

nated them, "wars and fighting." This they ought never to be; yet this they have been for the most part. The parties commonly accuse each other not only of error, but of dishonesty; and unhappily there is, in most cases, too much reason for these mutual criminations. Persuaded that he is the champion of the truth—set for the defense of the gospel—each conceives himself at liberty to use any weapon within his reach to defend his own positions, and to carry the war into the enemy's territory. He esteems nothing sacred that stands in the way of what he considers the vindication and triumph of "the faith once delivered to the saints." He is prepared to stab the reputation of his antagonist in any vulnerable point, if that will impair the force of his argument with the community, and to lacerate his feelings by unjust imputations and abusive language, in retaliation for similar insults, and even without such provocation. He does not scruple to supply what is wanting in the cogency of his argument by the pungency of his wit. He makes himself remembered as an enemy, rather than as a fair and honorable disputant. He exposes the purity of his faith to suspicion by his unchristian spirit, and hatred of him is naturally transferred to his creed. Some allowance, it is true, is to be made for mutual misapprehension. Occupying different positions, and viewing the subject from different points, having rushed to the encounter without proper consideration, it is not surprising that the parties should differ in stating the questions at issue between them. This would naturally happen were there no intention to misrepresent; and it is proved to be common by the complaints of unfairness called forth by every controversy. No one acknowledges himself fairly represented by his opponent—all complain of wrong—and to suppose they misapprehend each other, is the

most charitable explanation of the wrong—otherwise we must either deny its existence, or refer it all to intentional misrepresentation. Allowance must also be made for the force of custom. Although the manner of the controvertist is very apt to be determined by his inward spirit; yet it may be influenced, also, by the custom of conducting controversies with asperity. This custom, long established, has become the law of controversy—the mold into which it naturally runs and shapes itself. The controvertist deems himself at liberty to employ any of the weapons which use has sanctioned. Hence the harshness of his manner is not an infallible index of a malignant spirit. He may have a kinder and purer heart than we should suspect from the style of his pen.

But whatever may be the exact amount of criminality chargeable upon theological disputants, the terrible injury inflicted by their conflicts upon the cause of Christ, can hardly be exaggerated. The members of Christ have been riven asunder, not by difference of opinion, not by free discussion of their differences, but by disputation conducted with acrimony and unfairness. Misrepresentations, arising, sometimes from misapprehension, sometimes, no doubt, from design, have been, from time to time, incorporated into the literature of the sects, until they have established what threatens to be a lasting prejudice. If Christians had from the first conducted their controversies with urbanity, and while they manifested an earnest desire to commend the truth to universal belief, had shown as conscientious a regard for the laws of controversy—exaggerating nothing, and setting down nothing in malice—expressing toward their opponents none but generous feelings, the whole effect would have been good—the evils, which have made controversy the dread of the church, would never have been

known; "repentance to the acknowledging of the truth" would more frequently have crowned the contest; and the religion which had such advocates would more likely have been accepted, as worthy of its high claim to be divine.

Our readers will understand from these remarks, that we trace the evils complained of to the manner of controversy, not to controversy itself, which, properly conducted, we believe would be productive of good only. Controversy is that power which presides over the labors of the Essayist, of the Chair of Philosophy, and of the Pulpit; which subjects, indeed, all doubtful propositions to the crucible of reason; which brings truth into the light of demonstration, and tears from error the veil of plausibility, which ignorance and sophistry have cast over it. It begins in criticism, by calling opinions in question, which, if erroneous, it exposes and refutes; but which, if true, it only serves to confirm, by affording an occasion for displaying the evidence before the world. Disputing opinions which would otherwise be received by many on authority, and provoking a rejoinder, it brings up a re-investigation, and, in the end, strips error of its covering, and establishes the truth on a firmer basis.

There is one effect of controversy, in respect to which observing men are divided in opinion; some holding it to be a serious evil, and others regarding it with indulgence—we refer to the agitation of the public mind. *It will disturb the peace of church,* is a sufficient reason in the opinion of some for suppressing discussion, by any lawful means, on questions which are likely to divide and excite the community. Others regarding a dead calm as a greater evil than the fiercest excitement, are pleased to accept a theological controversy with all the sad consequences of the hottest conflict, for the sake of the clearer sky, which is ex-

pected to succeed the storm. We confess ourselves in sympathy with the latter class, rather than the former. We have less dread of a mountain torrent than of a stagnant pool; the one may swell into a desolating flood, but the other may breed a pestilence still more destructive. We concede too much, however, when we compare religious controversy to a destructive flood. It is controversy, as it has been too generally conducted, not as it should be, to which this comparison is applicable. There is something, we confess, in the very nature of controversy, to awaken animosity; for opposition to one's cherished opinions can never be agreeable, even if it should be conducted with perfect amenity and good breeding. But there is for this very reason a greater necessity of shunning every thing needlessly offensive to the other party.

In the exposition which we propose to offer, of the laws of controversy, we disclaim the pretension of novelty. We profess to have made no discoveries, and to have no views, which might not readily occur, on reflection, to any mind. We believe, however, that Christians generally have no well defined and settled views of the law of Christ on this subject, or of the extent to which it is violated by controversial writers; and we should be glad to aid in forming a correct public sentiment in respect to it, which no man, who values his reputation, would dare disregard.

Before defining the rule of duty on this subject, we would notice the relations of the controvertist to the truth.

The parties to a controversy may both be in error on the general subject at issue. History furnishes abundant illustrations of this fact. Those controversies in which the champions for the divine right of Presbytery contend against the equally exclusive claims of Episcopacy, belong to this category.

Neither party stood on tenable ground. They were right in denying each other's claims, while neither could maintain his own. Many of the fiercest conflicts have been waged upon points which could on neither side be established, and which, in some cases, were too frivolous to merit the least contention. Those who have inflamed the worst passions in the church, by violent controversy on such insufficient grounds, have a fearful account to render at the last day. It is manifest that all such controversies ought to cease.

But though both parties may possibly be contending for error, both can not be on the side of truth. One party, at least, must be designedly or undesignedly expending his energies against the cause of his master. The controve&rtist is therefore engaged in a business of terrible responsibility, on which assuredly no conscientious man will enter without fervent prayer, and careful study, lest he should be found fighting against God.

Both parties—the advocate of truth and his opponent—stand in one and the same relation to the law of Christ, in respect to the spirit and the manner of controversy. They are both within the pale of nominal Christianity. They both profess, though sometimes with serious qualifications, to take the Bible as their standard. They at least profess to be Christians; and their object in controversy is to commend their particular views of Christianity to the belief of others. Self-consistency, therefore, as well as other considerations, demand of them a sacred regard for the Christian law of controversy. The conviction that our opponent is a heretic, and an enemy of Christ, is no excuse for unchristian feelings toward him. Knowing what his views are—knowing, also, that they fail in his case to produce good fruit—we may have no confidence in his professions. Still this will not justify us in con-

ducting the controversy with him in an unchristian spirit. It is rather in such a case the more necessary, for the honor of our own better faith, that we should avoid giving just cause of prejudice by any breach of the Christian law of controversy.

The law of Christ, in respect to controversy, may be learned from his own example, and from the precepts of his word. His example is a safe guide. He was often, during his ministry, in controversy with the most unreasonable men. But in no instance do we find him resort to sophistry in defense and advocacy of the truth. He never seeks to silence an adversary by appeals to popular hatred. He never indulges in ridicule. He never misrepresents the opinions of others; never puts a false construction on their conduct; is never guilty of deceit. Though he could not be deterred by fear from uttering the truth, he could not even speak the truth for the pleasure of inflicting pain by it. He came into the world on an errand of love, not to the righteous, but to the wicked; not to friends, but to enemies; and their opposition to him, even to the shedding of his blood, never damped in the least the ardor of his charity. In this spirit only—the spirit of love—is it lawful for us to assume in the church the work of controversy. In this spirit of Christ we should imitate the example of Christ. We should hesitate to employ, in defense of his cause, any weapon which he, in his integrity or wisdom, refrained from using. So far as his example has force as a law to us, the path of duty is plain. But he has made it still plainer in his word. He tells us, by his Apostle, 2 Tim. 2: 24—26, that “The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle to all men; apt to teach; patient; in meekness instructing them that oppose themselves, if God will peradventure give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.” What a dif-

ferent spectacle from this do most theological combatants present to the gaze of the world ! One would judge from their pages, that meekness is the last grace to be exercised in controversy ; and patience next to the last. Victory seems to be their sole aim, and any means, however dishonorable, of accomplishing so good an end, they appear to think quite pardonable. Were we to accept the account which they give of each other as correct, we must consider both parties destitute, not only of Christian principle, but of common honesty. We have known intentional misrepresentation abundantly charged, and, in some cases, proved upon men, who, in any office but that of defenders of the faith, would be esteemed worthy of all credit. Were we to suppress this fact, especially were we to deny it, lest it should reflect some dishonor upon religion, we should be guilty of the very crime which we condemn. The history of the Christian Church, if written as it has actually passed under the eye of Omnipotence, would probably reveal moral obliquities in good men, that would overwhelm us with astonishment and shame ; yet it should be added to the honor of Christianity, that she extends no countenance to this wickedness of her professors. It is the dishonor of human nature, not of religion, that even the renewing grace of God does not at once raise mankind to a state of immaculate purity. We know of no other way of accounting for the particular obliquity of which we speak, but to suppose there is still lurking in the Protestant church that most corrupt principle, that the end sanctifies the means. This we have been accustomed to regard as the peculiar corruption of the church of Rome ; yet Protestants are certainly sadly infected by it. Nor is it very difficult to account for the fact. Good men are easily drawn, by a desire to do good, into approbation of what seems to them

the most efficient means. A measure of seeming utility, though unlawful, is seldom regarded with unmixed disapprobation. It was, we may charitably suppose, under this blinding influence, that good men in the early age of Christianity, fabricated epistles and memoirs in the names of apostles and saints, and published them to the world as genuine works. Their object was to check the spread of heresy ; and to do so great a good by what appeared to them to be a harmless artifice, occasioned them, probably, no very painful compunctions.

The same perversion of the moral sense has left its mark upon most of the controversial writings of the church. We do not, it is true, seek to carry our points by the forgery of books, for this in our day is impracticable ; but we have not discarded all artifice, all misrepresentation, all false issues, all dishonest argumentation. Nor are we entirely above the use of ridicule, and even of vituperation, for the better accomplishment of our good work. What a severe reproof do these theological wars deserve ! What a different manner of controversy is inculcated in the Scriptures ! The passage just cited, it is true, can be applied only in the way of accommodation to the controversies of which we are treating. It has primary reference to the manner in which Timothy was to meet the opposition of unbelievers ; but there is the same reason, and even a stronger reason why this conciliatory manner should be observed in the controversies of the church. The work to be done—the giving of instruction—is the same in both cases. The end to be accomplished, so far as the opposer himself is concerned, is the same ; but in religious controversy there is this further object to be gained, which indeed is the paramount object, the conviction of the community before which the discussion is brought. That manner of

controversy which is best fitted to effect a change in the views of our immediate antagonist, and secure a recantation of his errors, is the most likely to make a favorable impression on other minds. We are aware that the conversion of a controversial writer is not ordinarily to be expected; certainly not his public recantation. When this can be effected, it is the highest possible testimony to the force of truth; and it insures the completest success to the victorious party. And this achievement would not be so rare if the controversies of the church were conducted in the spirit of the apostolic injunction: "In meekness instructing." To instruct is to set the truth before the mind undiminished, unexaggerated, undistorted, uncolored; and to do this patiently, gently, in words that appease wrath, disarm prejudice and win regard, is to instruct with meekness. The manner of the controvertist, the Apostle insists, should be entirely respectful toward his opponents; not arrogant, not overbearing, not acrimonious, but calm, gentle and courteous; free from every thing calculated to irritate, and rich in whatever is fitted to disarm prejudice and attract approbation. He should endeavor to make his argument strong, that it may be convincing; and conviction can not fail to give pain wherever it is unwelcome. For this he is not responsible. It is the wanton wounding of his opponent's sensibilities by bad manners, or offending his sense of justice by misrepresentation, which the law of Christ forbids.

But this law has a deeper application. Like all other divine laws, it lays its hand on the heart; it requires the controvertist to answer in character to the outward conduct which is demanded of him. The evils of controversy spring for the most part out of the spirit of the controvertist. The radical fault is that he enters on his work, not as a Christian, with tru-

ly Christian affections, motives and purposes; not impelled by a simple love of truth, but by pride, envy, and malice; not overflowing with compassion for errorists, but burning with wrath against them. This is the common spirit of controversy, even if it is often begun and conducted in a better temper. The polemic leaves his Christian character behind him when he enters the lists; and it is with difficulty he finds it when he comes out of the conflict. He fights the whole battle in an implacable, unmerciful spirit; rejoicing in the wounds which he inflicts; and caring more for his own reputation as a combatant, than for the cause of truth. Inflamed with such passions, it is not wonderful that he meets resistance. The wrath which burns in his own bosom, he excites in the breast of his antagonist. Restrained, it may be, by the laws of good breeding from vulgar abuse, he still betrays the bitter enmity of his heart; the repellency of which drives him and his antagonist farther asunder, and more hopelessly, with every blow that is struck. The parties may be unable to convict each other of intentional misrepresentation, but they can not mistake each other's spirit; and so lose their confidence in each other's Christian character. And with this spirit, the tendency to unfair argumentation and to incivilities of Protean shape, is generally too strong to be resisted. How contrary all this is to the law of Christ, is manifest from the words of the Apostle, as well as from the example of the Master himself. "The servant of the Lord," he tells us, "must not strive, but be gentle to all men, apt to teach, patient; in meekness instructing." Gentleness, patience, and meekness, are qualities of a true Christian mind, never found conjoined at the same time, with pride, bitterness and wrath.

What the Bible thus teaches us is the law of controversy, requiring

of the disputant the spirit of love that reigned in his divine Master, and a manner corresponding with it, may also be learned from its manifest adaptation to the end to be attained. The controvertist seeks to convince his opponent, or at least to refute his errors to the conviction of those who witness the debate. He considers himself to be on the side of truth, and he wishes to produce the same conviction in the minds of others. The prejudices of his antagonist he may possibly despair of overcoming; but he is especially anxious to carry the more important point of convincing the community. These objects can be gained only by appropriate means; by argument and ornament adapted to convince and conciliate. Calumny and misrepresentation tend rather to confirm the previous impressions of an opponent, than to convince him of his errors; and the effect upon others is no better. We begin at once to suspect the goodness of a cause which we discover to be defended by unfair and dishonorable arts. He is an enemy of the truth who attempts to promote it by bad manners; he is its worst enemy who would defend it by deceit. The best policy is to aim directly at the conviction of our readers, not at the confusion of our antagonist; and while we demonstrate the folly of his opinions, we should endeavor to conciliate the good will of himself and his friends, and to relieve them from the embarrassment of defeat by our courteous bearing. Generosity to a conquered enemy always inspires respect for the conqueror. We need not therefore fear that the cause of truth will be made to suffer by civility to the errorist. If we would disarm him and accomplish the easiest victory, we must spare him the mortification, and ourselves the degradation, of an insult. Our strength lies in the weight of our arguments—*in the force of reason—not in our power of satire; not*

in the vivacity and keenness of our wit. To hold our adversary up to the public gaze in any false light, awakens in him and his supporters a sense of injustice; to make him smart under the lash of sarcasm, provokes a spirit of retaliation in him, and awakens sympathy for him in the community. Whoever resorts to such devices to gain the victory, is sure to suffer with a discerning public. Not only will he fail to gain a brother in the person of his antagonist, he will be likely, instead of refuting his errors to the satisfaction of all, to raise up a party to support him. It is a pity if he is set for the defense of the truth, for it will surely suffer in his hands. These words of the Apostle, “in meekness instructing them that oppose themselves, if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth”—are an inspired testimony to the preëminent adaptation of a generous and urbane manner to accomplish the true ends of controversy.

These ends are lost sight of by many controversial writers. They seem to regard their opponents, not as rational beings involved in error from which it is a virtue to recover them, but as criminals who deserve to be publicly immolated as a warning to other errorists. They wage a war of extermination against every dissident from the received faith, pursuing him as an outlaw whom it would be a crime to spare; hoping, if they can not crush him into conformity, at least to intimidate others by the violence of their assault. They design to suppress error by intimidation; and in effect warn every one who has a new thought struggling for utterance, to bury it in his own bosom, on pain of being held up to public reprobation as a pestilent heretic. This attempt to stifle free inquiry, by establishing a reign of terror over the mind, effectually prevents many men of acute sensibilities from publishing

views which might enlighten the world. Fair criticism they would welcome ; but observation if not experience has taught them, that their views will not be met with a courteous and simply argumentative review, refuting what is erroneous, and confirming what is true ; a review in the justice of which they must themselves acquiesce even if it should be unfavorable ; but they have been taught to expect, that they must defend their opinions, if they dare utter them, not against misapprehension only, but against misrepresentation, obloquy and defamation ; that they must suffer for the bare act of presuming to differ from the received opinions. They therefore prudently lock up their thoughts, to be published, if ever, after they have found the repose of the grave, leaving to posterity the benefit of what should have blessed their own age. This is to be regretted not solely because the truth is suppressed, but because error is thereby driven into concealment, where it can not be easily met and vanquished. Darkness is the natural element of error. It makes its way by stealth. It can not bear the light of discussion. Truth always triumphs in the open field. A man can hardly recover himself from errors which he cherishes in secret. He should be encouraged to declare them openly, that they may be refuted ; not merely banished from his own mind, but from others, and deprived of all chance of spreading in the world. Whether, therefore, we regard the effect of intimidation on the lover of truth who has ideas of great value concealed in his breast, or on the errorist who clings the more hopelessly to his delusions, it is plain that a great wrong is done to the cause of truth by this manner of controversy ; or rather, as we should say, by this suppression of free inquiry.

It would do us injustice if any should infer from our remarks, that we would sacrifice the truth to good

manners ; that we put the gentleman, in our esteem, above the faithful advocate of truth. We believe that it is better to offend than to be false ; and that if offense is taken at the truth, not at the manner of presenting it, the fault is that of the offended party, not of the offender. We believe there is a way of asserting truth in the fullest, clearest, strongest terms ; and of defending it against all perversion ; without the least taint of bitterness, without unfairness, without offensive personalities, without incivility to the other party. The character of a gentleman need not be laid aside by the Christian controve rtist, but must necessarily be maintained by him as a part of his panoply, if he would do his work well.

It would be equally a mistake if any should suppose that we disapprove of all severity. Nothing is more severe to errorists than the truth. There is a strong line of distinction between holding an opponent up to ridicule with malice preposse, and showing by the clear light of argument that his opinions are absurd and ridiculous. Our object should be to show the falsity of his opinions, not to expose him to contempt ; and then if with the evidence of their falsity comes out their ridiculousness, it should be no gratification to us, that it is pain to him. With Paul, we should rejoice, not that he was made sorrowful, but, if it should be so, that he sorrowed to repentance. In one word, in going into controversy, we should carry with us the Christian spirit ; giving ourselves to prayer, remembering how much the very nature of the work exposes us to irritation of temper ; studying to understand the whole matter at issue ; to divest ourselves of prejudice and party spirit ; to impress our opponent and all observers with a conviction of our honesty, candor and love of truth ; endeavoring prayerfully to maintain toward him a spirit of love, in spite

of every provocation. No one whom we think to be unworthy of such consideration should be accepted by us as an antagonist.

It would be a stranger misapprehension still, if any one should suppose that we are blind to our own sins in controversy. The New Englander has aimed to be true to the principles here asserted. We have in a few instances been provoked by insults and puerilities, arrogance and weakness, not into any bitterness of spirit, but into the infliction of condign punishment on the offender, which, instead of bringing him to repentance, awakened compassion for him in the community. We think our ill success in these transgressions of the outward law of controversy, should not only effect a reformation in us, but impress others with a love of the better way.

With these few exceptions, we, as critics, have always maintained a courteous bearing toward those whose opinions we have felt it to be our duty to oppose. This we are happy to believe is the estimation in which we are held by all our readers, without as well as within the pale of our own communion. We recollect but one instance in which a contrary testimony has been given (see *Church Review*, Vol. I, p. 83); and that is from an author who had been irritated by a heavy blow upon the reputation of his favorite work, and who we suspect has read those articles only in the *New Englander*, which were particularly severe because particularly just, against the errors of a party in his own communion. Whoever thinks unfavorably of our course, we hope will consent to an oblivion of past offenses, if we should succeed in redeeming the pledge virtually given in this article.

We have brought this subject before our readers, in full view of the demand yet to be made for the exercise of a spirit of allegiance to the Christian law of controversy.

In no previous age has the tendency to unanimity on all great questions been so strong. We now have the promise after ages of dissent and discord, of something like harmony in regard to political science, in regard to ethics, and even in regard to theology. The rapid diffusion of thought from mind to mind, from continent to continent, is beginning to yield its fruit in the production of a common faith. Still much remains to be done to complete the harmony of all good men. The spirit of the old controversies still lives in the sects. They are too jealous of each other, to discuss any question at issue between them with gentleness, patience and meekness. A new spirit, the spirit of Christian love, which never wantonly offends; a guileless spirit which never perverts the truth, needs to be breathed into the church universal. This will inspire mutual confidence by deserving it, and harmonize opinions by disarming prejudice.

But we deceive ourselves if we suppose that the questions which have hitherto divided the Christian world, being settled, will be rested in as the end of controversy. Many of these questions we predict, will be lost sight of, as too trifling to occupy the cares of the church amid the differences of the future. We have fallen upon the times foretold in the Bible, when many shall "run to and fro"—when truth as well as error shall be questioned and subjected to every possible test—shaking all things that the things which can not be shaken may remain. In this conflict the hearts of many will faint within them. Sustained by no strong reliance on the power of truth and the faithfulness of God, they will see with consternation the demolition of old party lines, and cry out in terror, "if the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?" The foundations will not be destroyed. They are they that will remain because they

can not be shaken. It is a calm assurance of this security which we hope may possess the breasts of all parties to the theological controversies of the future. This calm assurance will allay all painful excitement of the public mind, at the announcement of novel opinions. It will insure to those opinions a fair discussion, and to the cause of truth a conclusive determination of them. Every error which does not carry

its own denial on its face, will be refuted by argument, and not blown into importance by the persecution of its advocates. The friends of truth, being calm in the conviction of their strength, will no longer be tempted to defend their positions against the errorist by unlawful weapons. How desirable this assurance is for the peace of the churches in the coming conflicts, we need not say.

---

### THE RELATION OF THE STUDY OF JURISPRUDENCE TO THE ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF THE BACONIAN PHILOSOPHY.

LORD BACON deserves the epithet, "many-sided," among philosophers, as Shakespeare does among poets. Not that he advances at one time, an opinion of Epicurus, then another of Plato, and again a third of Zeno; but that the partisans of each sect in philosophy claim the same statements, and assert that the spirit of his philosophy is derived from their own. Nor is he simply a philosopher, as the term has been commonly defined; a cosmopolite, an original, a man of business; one finds it hard to decide whether he has all the "idols," or none. No system of philosophical criticism ranks him high enough to justify at all the impression, which every student of him has of his greatness. We shall have to make a new one, on purpose for him, as the lovers of Shakespeare have for the "myriad-minded" poet. Meanwhile something may be said from the lawyer's side, or corner. And first, as to the influence of the study of jurisprudence, in producing that "spirit of the age," of which the Baconian philosophy was the expression.

The Protestant Reformation—that first turbulent assertion of the independence of reason, and the worth of man; the gift of soul to the

masses; the concurrent rise of the lower classes, forcing the common wants of man upon the attention of the learned, and infinitely increasing the practical power of the race; the discovery of America, and of the passage to India, opening a boundless field of labor for these new powers; directing immense energies to commerce; forming new connections; and modifying the manners, industry, and government of the world—necessitated a change in the spirit of the age, from speculation to action. The immense interests thus originated, claimed for their management the highest exertion of a high order of intellect; the necessary effect of this application of intellect to practical affairs, was to produce rules for the conduct of such affairs, and a continual improvement of these rules; while the invention of printing, recording every thing, and publishing every thing, would induce the writing and systematizing of them, and so necessarily lead to a philosophy of action and of progress. The study of jurisprudence was among the causes, which contributed most to urge the advance, and shape the course, of all these events. The Roman law is a science nearly corresponding to the Baconian model.

A few political principles lie at the foundation of it ; the application of these principles to particular cases, according to the laws of justice and morality, constitutes the civil code. In digesting this code, the lawyers must have proceeded upon the theory of our common law, where, as in the natural sciences, new rules are not originated and promulgated by absolute authority ; but it is taken for granted, that there is a legal right, or body of unwritten laws existing, prior to their delivery and formal adoption in the courts ; and a decision determines, not what the law shall be, but what it is. Using the language of science, the judges may be said to *discover*, in the case of new precedents, what the law is, just as, in investigating natural phenomena, the naturalist discovers natural laws ; and the method of discovery is the same, except that as men are not so sure to act according to law, as planets are, and the attention of the judges is directed chiefly to perturbations, it is necessary to place more comparative reliance upon principles before established. The truth of each supposed discovery, is carefully tested by applying it to continual causes ; and, if it is found not to answer the ends of justice, it is decided to be no law.

The law, then, is a *progressive* science ; having, for its *end*, the benefit of man ; for its *means*, the protection of his rights of personal security, liberty, and private property ; for its *method*, the continual establishing of new principles, by an examination and comparison of facts and principles already established ; for its *test of truth*, the application of its principles to business.

It will at once be seen, that the extensive and diligent study of such a science must have had a most beneficial effect. As early as the eleventh century, it became very common, and, finally, almost universal throughout Europe. The conquering barbarians, and the con-

quered Romans, were now coalescing into new bodies, and the spirit of these laws was the life that was breathed into most of the masses, shaping them into organic wholes, making them states.

Thousands flocked to the principal cities of Italy to study them. All the clergy were learned in them. The enthusiasm was universal. Albertus Magnus makes the blessed virgin herself a civilian and a canonist. "The excellency of an advocate," he says, "lies in three things, to gain a desperate cause, from a just judge, against a wily adversary ; but the blessed virgin gained a favorable judgment, 'Apud judicem sapientissimum ; dominum contra adversarium callidissimum, diabolum, in nostra causa desperata.' "

This was the only practical learning of the dark ages. The subtle intellects, which would weigh the down from the plumage of an angel's pinions, maintained their relations to this world by the study and practice of the law ; and these same intellects, which we sneer at, as we see them dancing, with their thousand spirits, upon a needle's point, should acquire a portentous importance in the eyes of a money-loving age, as they glide through the statutes of mortmain, with the wealth of half a kingdom upon their backs. With the advance of the race in practical power, the study of jurisprudence became more extensive, and more intelligent ; while the other learning was engrossed in theology and dialectics, in law alone was found a tolerable substitute for moral and political science. The lawyers led the way in commerce, education, and government ; and finally, in the person of Lord Bacon, of philosophy.

Upon the 16th of June, 1573, was entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, Francis Bacon, aged 12, fifth son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper, a diligent and success-

ful lawyer and statesman; and Anne, his second wife, daughter of Sir Anthony Cook, eminent for her attainments as a linguist and theologian; one of the most learned and delectable ladies of the age.

Master Frank was an excellent scholar; but, though he learned his tasks, he laughed at his teachers. Colleges, always conservative, were then in a dotage, mumbling the wise words of by-gone centuries; conserving the spirit of the dark ages. The whole mind of that young scholar was alive with the spirit of the living present; his heart had already swelled with ambition at sweet words of compliment from Elizabeth; tales of navigators to new and brave worlds, at the setting and the rising sun, had doubtless kindled his imagination; the unspeakable aspirations and hopes of young genius, pregnant with noble conceptions and vast designs, were stirring vigorously within him; gorgeous visions, as of a new Atlantis, rolled before his mind like the moving mass of ocean, and a voice was in his soul, crying, onward; as if the billows spoke, as they marched on, and the winds sung it, as they swept on—onward! ever onward! He took up the word, and it was the life of a new philosophy. Theologians were still preaching the intellectual depravity, and perpetual deterioration of the race; philosophers were teaching a corresponding lesson; they looked back to Aristotle and Plato, and saw themselves to be but faint reflections of those great lights of science. The pigny present despaired before the giant past, or strutted behind it, “non passibus sequis,” in humble imitation.

The learned professors of law alone had already vindicated the dignity of the present, and expressed a most assured foresight of the coming progress of the race. “Neither,” says one of them, “were the ancients giants, nor are we dwarfs, but all men of the same standard; and

we the taller of the two, by adding their height to our own.” It was from these, then, already made familiar to him by his father and his uncle at home, that Bacon was imbued, thus early, with the progressive spirit.

It was from the same source, that he derived his sentiment of toleration. Indifference seems, sometimes, to have done more to establish truth, than the love of truth itself; as Rousseau says, the atheists of the French Revolution, laid down the purest and highest morality the world had known, because they considered it a mere matter of speculation, in which they had no personal concern. It has been eminently so with this matter of toleration. Papists and Protestants were then alternately murdering each other; schools in philosophy were wrangling with the bitterness of death. The shrewd old lawyers at the head of the English government, who, to say truth, cared little about religion or philosophy, taught and acted upon the principles of toleration, as far as their own safety would permit. From these, Bacon obtained, we think, that spirit which had already, before he left college, in his sixteenth year, led him to project a reform in philosophy, which should make it progressive and comprehensive; the spirit of progress and toleration.

By this time, Bacon had probably arrived at a conception, more or less distinct, of that end of philosophy, which he so eloquently set forth in his later life; the use and comfort of man.

The distinction between his and the former philosophies, will be most distinctly seen by speaking of the end and means together. The ancients had proposed various ends for man, as pleasure, contentment, action—but so far as they proposed to do any thing for these ends, it was by direct education. The Epicurean made men happy, by teaching them

the precepts of Epicurus. The Stoics made men virtuous, by teaching them the precepts of Zeno;—their systems were educative; their means, the development of philosophers. Bacon was content to state his end as the good of man, without troubling himself to discuss the supreme good. He evidently had in mind the legal goods of a thriving citizen in a well ordered state, the virtuous enjoyment of life, liberty, and property; but he objected to no kind of good, except that abstract good, which is good for nothing. His means of attaining this end, was the increase of useful knowledge and useful inventions. He considered these as a sort of hoarded happiness. If they did not render the inventors happy, they would sometime add to the mass of human happiness. They were happiness solidified, subjected to weight and measure, buying and selling. If Zeno were to look around one of our factories, with its miracles of machinery, and its miserable mannikins of men, he would cry aloud to them with groans, "get more soul!" Bacon would gaze exultingly upon the scene—"toil on! toil on! every new fabric will be so much good for some one, no matter whom; so many yards of happiness."

The first advances the individual, but keeps the race stationary. What need of additions to the general stock? That which educated Aristotle, will certainly educate me.

The second neglects the individual, in the race; "and the individual withers, and the world is more and more." The Greek left the school of Socrates intent upon molding himself into such a character as his teacher; our ambition is to discover a planet or a new and useful bug, or to invent a lightning rod, or a safety lamp, or at least, a new organization of society. The Stoic would be something; the Baconian must do something. Here also Bacon shows the lawyer. Theologi-

ans have always held the Grecian end and means; they insist upon one supreme good; a spiritual state, in comparison with which, all other good is evil, all other attainment so idle, that he who has reached it may be totally depraved. They are educators also, and look for God's blessing upon the direct application of truth to the soul. Bacon transferred the ends of law to other sciences. How completely these ends engrossed his mind, is no where more distinctly seen than in his constant and bitter charges of barrenness against the old philosophy; for surely he overlooked its aims, when he said that it bore no fruit. Fruit! what fruit should it produce? The groves of Academus were not planted with steam-engines, or lightning rods. Men grew there. Its fruit is to be sought in the men who have matured under its influences—and what a harvest! Was there nothing ripe, and mellow, and juicy in the soul of Plato, on whose infant blossom the honey-bees alighted, and no seed thoughts in the core of his spirit? Was Aristotle nothing, but a choke-pear of disputation? a metaphysical burr, with no meat in the center? Was not Marcus Aurelius a sound and wholesome product? an imperial growth worthy of propagation? Such as these have been the fruits of the Grecian philosophy wherever it has been planted; by the stately palaces of the Medici; by the monasteries of Germany; by the academic halls of England; or, beyond the currents of Oceanus, in the lone wilds of America. Fruit glorious and imperishable! aid and comfort also, through all time, to universal humanity! The method of Bacon, the inductive method, though it had already been pointed out by Aristotle, has been generally considered by philosophers the chief merit of his system. But the legal and political commentators seem disposed to pass it over very slightly. Mac-

auley, for example, in his showy and sophistical review, says that "scarcely any person, who proposed to himself the same end with Bacon, could fail to hit upon the same means." However incorrect this opinion may be, it shows how nearly akin the inductive method is to those pursued in the law.

But Bacon added the lawyer's test of truth; its working well. He wanted no truths which could not produce or prophesy, and he judged them by their fruits. Knowledge was truth to him, if he could make nature act, or foretell her courses by it; otherwise, not,—a test always sure to give the clearest ideas of causes; but excluding all other relations, an unerring guide to truth in physics, where only truth will act; but in civil business, where, as Bacon himself says, "falsehood, like an alloy in coin of gold and silver, may make the metal work the better," it is but a slow guide to purity or truth. It consecrates means for the sake of the end.

We have spoken of the spirit of the Baconian philosophy, comprehension, and progress; of its end, the good of man; of its means, useful knowledge, and useful inventions; of its method, the inductive process; of its test of truth, the consequences of it: and claimed to find, in all these, traces of the study of jurisprudence, not in such a sense, that any good lawyer might have written the *Novum Organum*, or that a better lawyer would have made a better philosophy. Sir Edward Coke would, doubtless, have made a worse one, but it would have been more like Bacon's, than one by Luther or Erasmus. It is in tracing the history of jurisprudence, and the useful arts alone, that Baconianism seems to grow up naturally; to be the "birth of time;" and it is in these, and the sciences to which they have given rise in the hands of Grotius and Montesquieu, and in political economy and legislation, that the

glory of the Baconian philosophy consists. It has no direct, legitimate claim, to those sublime, but, in Bacon's sense, barren studies, astronomy and geology; for, in conclusion, it savors of the faults, as well as the excellences, of the legal profession.

They may be summed in a sentence. Bacon did not love truth for its own sake, and he denied its relations to God. He was devout, too, in his way; but he held his creed by will, and not by reason; he delighted in absurdities, to use, with Sir Thomas Brown, that odd resolution, learned out of Tertullian—"Credo, quia impossibile." He denied final causes, and so left an unspanned abyss between man and his God.

In the infancy of science, men believed all things made for them; to give them food, the earth was peopled; to give them light, the sun, and moon, and stars, were created; God works for them alone. Then a science of utility is natural; but when the telescope has opened the heavens, depth beyond depth, and the microscope has revealed its wondrous and countless races, and the history of the world has been traced back, ages upon ages, before man was; he sees, with humility, his true relations to the universe, and science, expanding with his thought, embraces beauty, right, and religion, as well as utility.

Lord Bacon clung to this earth, and the old theory of the solar system; but if he be not one of those sublimer souls, who delight to be present in spirit with God, when of old he laid the foundations of the earth, and to raise the voice of praise, with the morning stars, which sang together, or, far through the infinite realms of space, to go sounding on, sphere beyond sphere, forever and forever; as the genius of his philosophy, he is seen moving among the crowds of men, in their marts of business, or legislative

halls ; with trumpet-voice proclaiming the worth, and the high destiny of man ; or, nobler and diviner still, in the low and lone hut, by the flickering light of poverty's cold fire, by the restless bed of sickness ; wherever shivering want can be warmed, or the fevered brow be

soothed, he is seen moving with a look like His, " who pitied men ;" touching sad hearts to tears of joy, and wielding the elements to perform the miracles of love.

" Shall not his name lead all the rest,  
Who wisely loved his fellow-men ?"

#### REVIEW OF LONGFELLOW'S "EVANGELINE."\*

THE soft Gallic title, " *Evangeline, a Tale of Acadie*," led every one who looked at the book through the medium of " *Excelsior*," and those spirited translations, so industriously elaborated from the other modern languages of Europe, into our own, to cut the leaves with hasty fingers. The very word, Acadie, falling upon the ear with a dreamy cadence, suggestive to the imagination of flowery meadows, sylvan retreats and bowers, where primeval nature might recline and hold familiar discourse with modern provincial life, remote from the hum of the city, operated as a kind of charm. Every reader, who opened the book, was predetermined to be pleased. He said involuntarily to himself, now I will, for one little hour, forget the corn laws, the tariff, the Oregon question, the Mexican war, the extension of the area of freedom, and the prospects of different men for the next presidential canvass. I will go back to the days that Horace and Akenside loved to figure to themselves. I will spirit myself away from the steam-whistle, and the railway station, to haunts where Sidney would have laid aside his sword in sweet abandonment to the tones of his favorite lute. I will take Shenstone along with me, and Burns, and Bloomfield. In short, I will have a holiday. It is also safe

to presume that, in spite of the unusual meter in which the writer chose to present his subject, almost every reader would have been pleased with that fanciful little prelude, uniting the murmurs of the forest-foliage and moss, with the wild, though not more varied, responses of the " deep-voiced neighboring ocean." Nor is the description of Grand Prè, where the scene of the poem is laid, in any way calculated to destroy this favorable impression. It is at once lively and minute. You have a picture of a sweet agricultural village, reposing in a fruitful valley, with orchards and corn-fields, stretching away to the south and west ; on the north, a mountain, crowned with venerable forests, and the broad ocean, with promontory, bay, and cavern, lying like a vast map upon the eastern horizon. Sea-mists, like armies in battle array, skirt the mountains in the distance. The distaff, the shuttle, the wheels of the laborer's wain returning homeward, the song of maidens and the frolicsome, unrestrained glee of children, mingle their various notes with the soothing influences of evening. The accustomed bell breathes its tremulous tones musical, and full of moral meaning, over this little world of happy homes. It is true, the language is rude and unpolished ; but this bluntness is lost sight of in the happy grouping, and easy drapery, of the poet's images.

\* *Evangeline*, by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. W. D. Ticknor & Co., Boston.

From this general sketching and landscape painting, the writer proceeds to a particular description of the principal personages, who are to figure in the poem. It was one of the favorite maxims of Horace, that a passage of true poetry has a certain vigor of sentiment, and harmonic richness of tone, which can not be entirely destroyed by transposing the words, or even by translating them into plain prose. Let us apply this touchstone to the following lines :

" Somewhat apart from the village, and nearer the basin of Minas,  
 Benedict Bellefontaine, the wealthiest farmer  
 of Grand Prè,  
 Dwelt on his goodly acres ; and with him,  
 directing his household,  
 Gentle Evangeline lived, his child, and the  
 pride of the village.  
 Stalworth and stately in form was the man  
 of seventy winters ;  
 Hearty and hale was he, an oak that was  
 covered with snow-flakes ;  
 White as the snow were his locks, and his  
 cheeks as brown as the oak leaves ;  
 Fair was she to behold, that maiden of seven-  
 teen summers.  
 Black were her eyes, as the berry that grows  
 on the thorn by the way-side ;  
 Black, yet how softly they gleamed beneath  
 the brown shade of her tresses ;  
 Sweet was her breath, as the breath of kine  
 that feed in the meadows,  
 When, in the harvest heat, she bore to the  
 reapers at noon tide  
 Flagons of home-brewed ale : oh ! fair in sooth  
 was the maiden ! "

Now, under the application of Horace's rule, if we render these thirteen lines into prose, we shall have a result similar to the following. Benedict Bellefontaine, the wealthiest farmer of Grand Prè, lived on his goodly acres, and the gentle Evangeline, his child, and the pride of the village, lived with him, directing his household. This man of seventy winters was stalworth and stately in form ; he was hearty and hale ; an oak that is covered with snow-flakes ; his locks were as white as snow, and his cheeks as brown as oak leaves. That maiden of seventeen summers was fair to behold ; her eyes were black as the berry that grows on the thorn by the way-side ; black, yet how softly they

gleamed beneath the brown shade of her tresses. Her breath was sweet as the breath of kine that feed in the meadows. Now, it is almost impossible to transpose this passage in any way that will render it more prosaic and common-place, than it appears in the book. In the first place, you have the picture of Benedict Bellefontaine, a farmer, who (strange to say) lived on his own farm ; who had turned the management of his household affairs over to his daughter. In the very poetical and classical words of the author, he was a "hearty, hale" old man, about seventy years old—an oak, covered with snow-flakes, says the poet—a metaphor, which certainly has the merit of originality to recommend it. But fearing, lest his readers should be in doubt as to the proportions and proper disposition of its parts, he tells them that the snow is meant to represent the locks of the old man, and that the foliage of the oak is meant to shadow forth the color of his cheeks. This guarded explanation puts one in mind of the amusing dialogue between Snug and Bottom, in "Midsummer Night's-Dream."

*Snug.* " You can never bring in a wall—what say you, *Bottom* ? "

*Bottom.* " Some man or other must present wall, and let him have some plaster, or some lome, or some rough cast about him, to signify wall. Or let him hold his fingers thus, and through that cranny shall Pyramus and Thisbe whisper."

But poor Evangeline, her worst enemy, could not have treated her with more unnatural severity than the poet, who called her into being. She is just seventeen years old—(such darlings of the imagination are always *just seventeen*)—with a pair of eyes, that look for all the world like a couple of blackberries, that grow on a thorn (probably the author thought the word blackberry bush unpoetical) by the way-side. Lest there should be some misunder-

standing, and you should infer that she had a small piercing black eye, too black to express subdued sentiment, and languishing love—an eye, which poets, of all ages, have abhorred—he informs you, in the next verse, that their too piercing ray is softened, in some degree, beneath the brown shade of her tresses. As respects that *other qualification* of his heroine, had Mr. Longfellow been any thing more than a *theoretical* Acadian farmer, he must have known that, let his kine feed in meadows, or where they may, he was, by this comparison, not only offering an insult of the grossest kind to Evangeline, but offending the taste of every reader, who knows any thing of the peculiarities of those horned animals of whom the poet seems so caressingly fond.

Passing by the bee-hives and "the old moss-covered bucket," with its bewitching adjunct of "a watering-trough for horses," we come to the barns and barn-yard, where let us linger with the poet awhile, in rapt and hallowed musings. Behold the farming utensils of all sorts, from the wain, the plow and harrow, newly purchased, down to the wasted relics of many a predecessor in all the stages of dissolution. And there, walking in aristocratic pride, the swollen turkey and the cock, whom, "surrounded by his seraglio," in spite of poor morbid Beatie's appellation of "fell chanticleer," our enamored bard could almost embrace. Those barns must have been a sight to be sure, to feast a poet's eye, a village of them, says the chroicler, with dove-cotes and corn-lofts, (with stair-cases leading to them,) and every barn, so filled with hay as to be bursting, like a ripe canteleup, in the sun. Surely, the Earl of Northumberland's stables and outbuildings, nay, Paris itself, must have been insignificant in the comparison; and, to finish the picture, while they delight the ear, behold and listen to a multitude of

weathercocks, which are said to be without number, "rattling and singing incessantly of mutation." The music of the spheres must have been quite old-fashioned and monotonous, if heard in contrast with this sublime and soul-stirring anthem. The next character appearing, in the order of the story, is Gabriel, the hero, the son of a blacksmith, (for they had a stithy in Acadie,) a very respectable young man in his way, though possessed of some personal peculiarities as a lover, which we shall have occasion to note by-and-bye. Our young lovers had been schoolmates in childhood it seems, and were in the habit of spending a good deal of time in the blacksmith's shop, "where they stood," says the poet, (with great enthusiasm,) with "wondering eyes, to behold Basil, the father of Gabriel, take in his leathern lap the hoof of the horse, as a play-thing." While they were not occupied in this way, they were hunting for swallows' nests in the barns. By this time, we are to suppose Evangeline grown up to womanhood, and so popular among the farmers as to receive the euphonious title of "Sunshine of Eulalie," because it was supposed that *that sort of sunshine* had some mysterious sympathy with the apple orchards.

The second canto of the poem opens with a beautiful description of a northern autumn, which has more of the picturesque in it than is to be found in any other part of the poem. The description of his heroine's heifer, however, with her "snow white hide," and lofty gait, savors rather more of the shambles than of Acadie. If Mr. Longfellow has any *nervous* readers, he might have spared them the smell of the salt-marsh hay as too aromatic and pungent for an invalid. The gigantic wooden saddles, of flaming color and crimson tassels "nodding in bright array," like so many holly-hocks in blossom, must have been

more imposing than any tournament in which the chevalier Bayard ever bore victorious arms. The association of ideas is certainly one of the most interesting and unaccountable phenomena in the metaphysical world; and we suppose it would puzzle even Dugald Stewart to thread the labyrinths of analogy in a poet's brain, with a rational hope of meeting any where in his walk, a hollyhock and saddle in intimate, friendly connection. But this is a new era of the world, we are told, and perhaps this passage may serve to form a *digression* to some chapter in the next edition of Mr. Mill's logic. The lines descriptive of the milking in the yard are as follows:

"Patiently stood the cows meanwhile, and yielded their udders  
Unto the milkmaid's hand; whilst loud and in regular cadence  
Into the sounding pail the flowing streamlets descended;  
Lowing of cattle and peals of laughter were heard in the farm-yard,  
Echoed back by the barns."

The sublimity and colossal grandeur of this passage call vividly to mind Lord Byron's graphic description of one of the grandest cataracts in Europe.

"A roar of waters; from the headlong height,  
Velino cleaves the waveworn precipice;  
A fall of waters—rapid as the light,  
The flashing mass foams shaking the abyss.  
A hell of waters—how they howl and hiss  
And boil in endless torture."

The next scene in the poem introduces us into Benedict's kitchen, where the proprietor sits in his elbow-chair solus, looking into the fire, and although he sits as still as if his feet were in the stocks, his own uncourteous shadow taking advantage of his face being turned, comes into the room, and after making mouths and fantastic gestures at him awhile, "vanished away into darkness." What an ill-bred Caliban this umbra of Bellefontaine's must have been. The delicate Ariel never could have had the heart to demean himself in this way towards his master. Neither could Puck have vanished so soon, though with

the speed of the magnetic telegraph he "could put a girdle round the earth in forty minutes." Another remarkable simile has suggested itself to the poet's mind in contemplating the interior of this kitchen. In the ancient classic poetry, and more especially in the two great epics of Homer and Virgil, the shield of the warrior is a theme of especial and oft-recurring laudation. In the panoply of Mars and in the armor of the humblest hero of the days of the Roman consuls, it occupies a place equally conspicuous. Tasso has not forgotten it in the siege of Jerusalem, and Milton has placed it in the van of the fiercest conflicts on the plains of heaven. Now Mr. Longfellow in looking among the lumber of this kitchen, has discovered a cupboard filled with pewter platters reflecting the flickering light from the chimney, and straightway to his enraptured gaze they seem to be the shields of armies, flashing back the sunshine in the heat of battle. While the old man is singing Christmas carols, and Evangeline filling up the pauses in the song with the delectable accompaniment of the spinning-wheel, a thundering tread is heard, the door swung open as if it had been hit by a battering-ram, and Benedict knows "by the clatter of the hob-nailed shoes," that he is honored by the presence of Basil the blacksmith. Evangeline's poor little heart is in a tempest of flutter and alarm at this unceremonious arrival, and the poet insists on it that she shall, in the midst of the gasconade and rude raillery of the men, light the pipe with her own hand, and present it to the new guest. Then succeeds a prolix and turbulent political talk, much less interesting to the reader than that which assailed the ears of the hen-pecked slumberer of Sleepy-Hollow when he awoke from his twenty years' repose. We will pass by the old notary public, with his enchanting freedom of man-

ner, his "shocks of yellow hair," his hundred grand-children, all sitting on his knee, (whether at the same time or not, we are not informed,) his great watch ticking like a trip-hammer, and his immense horn spectacles playing at see-saw across his nose, and giving him, says our muse, a "look of wisdom *supernal*." Can it be that the Supernals of Olympus ever surveyed Juno, or darted sentimental glances at Hebe through the softened, spiritualized medium of horn-spectacles? It is equally foreign to our purpose to recite in this article any part of that long anecdote of the statue of justice that once stood, the notary had no idea where, filled with young magpies, with which he silenced without convincing the obstreperous Basil. But if we could have seen all the blacksmith's "thoughts *congealed* into lines on his face as *vapors freeze* into fantastic shapes on the window-frames in the winter," we would have cheerfully pardoned many faults. It must have been a sight to make each particular hair stand on end—a thing to see, not to hear. After the marriage papers are all drawn and the game of chess over, the lovers seat themselves at one of the east windows for a little private conversation, and look out upon a scene that beggars all description. The moon is just rising over the placid sea and the mist of the meadows, when lo,

"Silently one by one in the infinite meadows of heaven,  
Blossomed the lovely stars, the *forget-me-nots* of the angels."

After Evangeline had retired to her chamber for the night, we find the eccentric lover Gabriel, prowling like a robber among the apple trees and trying to get a peep in at the window, by the combined aid of lamplight and moonlight. We do not blame Gabriel for not being well-bred, but common délicacy should have been his monitor in all his thoughts and feelings respecting this dearest of objects.

It might be a matter of some doubt to one not well schooled in the rules of Acadian life, whether the pic-nic or rustic celebration that followed the next day would have resulted in the completion of the nuptials, had it not been interrupted in so uncivil a manner by the British forces. Indeed there is such a graceful obscurity hanging over this part of the poem, that it is only by implication that we learn why the male population of Grand Prè were shut up in the church and the other sex excluded. The parting of the lovers is well sketched. The fire on the sea-beach and the despairing villagers around it, is worthy of the pen of a poet. But there is something laughable in the minuteness of the bard in informing us that at the burning of the village of Grand Prè, "the cocks began to crow in the barn yard, thinking the day had dawned." It is quite problematical whether, had our informant been present at the fire he would have had presence of mind to think of this incident, and relate it in tones of such touching simplicity. Poor cocks, Christmas must have been a "civic game to that uproar!" Perhaps that identical cock introduced to the reader in the early part of the poem, "who crowed with the self-same voice that in ages of old had startled the penitent Peter," was among them. The death of Benedict and his burial by the sea-shore are well portrayed.

Part second of the work opens with the statement that many years have passed away since the destruction of the village of Grand Prè, and that the Acadians were

"Scattered like flakes of snow when the wind from the northeast  
Strikes aslant through the fog that darken the banks of Newfoundland."

Poets have often been in a fog in all ages of the world, and so have orators and diplomats and historians. Does Mr. Longfellow mean to tell us that it snows in foggy weather off

the Newfoundland coast, when the wind is in the northeast; or that a fog wind scatters the snow instead of melting it? During all these many years, Evangeline who was seventeen years old at the commencement of the story, remained, like the goddesses of Grecian song, still "fair and young." She lingered for some time about the old home of her infancy, at length she began to wander, "urged by the fever within her, and a restless longing, searching in church-yards and gazing upon tomb-stones." The reader at this stage of the story begins to believe that the poor maiden has gone mad, and his sympathies are correspondingly awakened. But this is far from being the case. She is sane enough to make all suitable inquiries requisite to find the lost object. She asks her old neighbors if they have seen him, and they tell her that he went with Basil to the prairies, and that they were earning a livelihood by hunting and trapping. Others who seem to have been in the interest of the Le Blanc family, told her he was in the lowlands of Louisiana, and advised her to desert Gabriel and marry Baptise, one of the twenty sons of the old notary, who it seems had served an apprenticeship of "many a tedious year" of love. To all which Evangeline very tragically replies, "I can not."

Under the mentorship of the old priest who tells her not to despair, says the poet,

"Did that poor soul wander in want and cheerless discomfort,  
Bleeding barefooted over the shards and thorns  
of existence."

Does the author mean to have us understand these two lines metaphorically or literally? If metaphorically, in what psychological class would a baresfooted soul take rank? If, on the other hand, we are to understand that she did literally wander from the north Atlantic coast to the lowlands of Louisi-

ana, in company with a father in the Romish church, who was not possessed of sufficient humanity, to say nothing of gallantry, to provide her with a covering for her feet, the forty years' journey of the Israelites in the wilderness must have been rapture in the comparison. The poet asks permission of his Muse, "to follow the wanderers' footsteps." Why can not we be as fortunate? For though we have repeated the invocation in due form, the perverse Muse who has perhaps no feelings in common with the reader, permits us to see no trace of the path over which settle the mists of an inscrutable gloom. Sometimes it is true the stray breezes that curl the surface of the Ohio, the Wabash and the Mississippi, sweeping away the mists, let in glimpses of sunshine upon the boat of our heroine as it dances upon the waters of those noble streams, but these momentary glances, like the shapes of a feverish dream, are soon swallowed up in darkness. Sometimes we meet her in the windings of some cypress grove, like Una in pursuit of the Redcrosse knight; sometimes she sleeps on leaves or grass in the damp swamps, exposing herself to quotidian agues and the most deadly fevers, or where the "owl greeted the moon with 'demoniac laughter.'" That old solemn bird, who like a monk has enjoyed the dim subdued light of cathedrals and church-towers, and clung to them even while in ruins, long after priest and book and bell and missal had deserted their crumbling walls; that gothic bird who in hermit seclusion, according to Gray, used to complain to the moon of those who disturbed "her ancient solitary reign"—that wizard bird with which many a Scotch poet has frightened the peasantry of the north of Britain, has since she became an American citizen, fallen into a driveling dotage, greeting the moon with demoniac laughter. "It is melancholy, says a French writer, mel-

ancholy indeed, when genius survives his faculties." After meeting and passing by the very man of whom they were in pursuit, and after, we know not how many years of wandering, our travelers came to a river flowing between mountains, near which a column of rising smoke indicated a human habitation. It was a plain mansion, in the rear of which was a path leading through a grove of oaks, and skirting the grove was an immense prairie. On the line between wood and prairie, was a mounted horseman in the garb of a huntsman arrayed in deerskin doublet, and gaiters of the same. The following lines speak for themselves, and need little comment.

"Broad and brown was the face that from  
under the Spanish umbrero  
Gazed on the peaceful scene with the lordly  
look of its master.  
Round about him were numberless herds of  
kine, that were grazing  
Quietly in the meadows and breathing the  
vapory freshness  
That uprose from the river and spread itself  
Over the landscape.  
Slowly lifting the horn that hung at his side,  
and expanding  
Fully his broad deep chest, he blew a blast  
that resounded  
Wildly and sweet and far through the still  
damp of the evening.  
Suddenly out of the grass the long white horns  
of the cattle  
Rose like flakes of foam in the adverse cur-  
rents of the ocean;  
Silent a moment they gazed, then bellowing  
rushed o'er the prairies,  
And the whole mass became a cloud, a shade  
in the distance."

The above described personage proved to be no less than our old friend Basil, the blacksmith. It is not entirely obvious to the reader what could have been his motive in blowing that wild, sweet blast upon the horn, nor does it appear whether those antics of the cattle were indications of alarm, or pleasure at the music. Were they wild kine, or did they belong to Basil: if the latter why should he take so much pains to frighten his own herds? Basil is very glad to entertain his guests in his western home, and they give way to mutual greetings and "friendly embraces." All this while

Gabriel came not, and dark misgivings stole over the maiden's heart. Basil is now compelled to confess with some awkwardness that his hopeful son, to whom neither love nor gallantry had ever suggested the idea of going to the only place where he might hope to find his lady—that lady who had even now completed a journey of thousands of miles to hunt him down—has just gone to the town of Acloye "to trade for mules with the Spaniards," and that he will after this adventure is over, "follow the Indian trails to the Ozark mountains," where it is his intention to establish himself as a trapper. He further added that Gabriel had grown so overbearing and unmanageable that even he, his own father was but too glad to get rid of him, and closed his story by advising the luckless girl to get up early in the morning and start off after him through the dew, "follow him fast and bring him back to 'his prison,' for that the winds and the streights were against him."

Unhappy Evangeline, if the winds and streams were ever against mortal maiden, they are surely adverse to thee! "Verily, the course of true love never did run smooth." During that evening, Basil, with the honest pride of what we call, in the United States, a self-made man, regaled his visitors with the striking contrast between his present situation and his humble circumstances, while a resident in Canada. When he comes to allude to the unpleasant incident of having one's house and barn burned up, and his cattle stolen by the depredating English, he works himself up to such a pitch of fury, as to alarm the whole circle. Says the poet:

"He blew a wrathful cloud from his nostrils,  
And his huge, brawny hand, came thundering  
down on the table,  
So that the guests all started, and Father  
Felician astounded  
Suddenly paused with a pinch of snuff half-  
way to his nostrils."

What a theme for a painter! The

pale, weeping, love-wasted Evangeline, sitting in melancholy abstraction, with down-cast eye, in one corner of the room; the uproarious fiddler, Michael, with long hair and beard, his instrument reposing against his chin, and his fingers wandering in careless prelude among its magical strings; next to him, standing the noisy lord of the mansion, ranting in bad provincial French—blowing wrathful clouds from his nostrils—hammering away upon the table with a fist that might have made a deep indentation in an Acadian anvil—and a little remote, to protect his ocular organs from "the wind of all this commotion," the fastidious, nervous Father Felician, trembling in his sandals, looking on in wild wonder, and grasping, with desperate resolution, the pinch of snuff, that has been thus remorselessly arrested in its passage to his nose. If there are no painters now living of sufficient genius to master the subject, might not Mr. Powers be induced to make himself immortal, by a group of Acadian statuary?

The next morning, according to agreement, the party begins its Quixotic march in pursuit of Gabriel; and never, since the days of the Italian romances, did mortal lady-errant run such hazards by night or day—such perils by fire and water—such hair-breadth escapes. Sometimes noxious swamps interrupted her way, sometimes the wolf howled on her track, or more savage Indian darted his keen eye from the thicket; now the fire-flies danced in dizzy mazes upon the edge of interminable prairies, and the next moment some malignant fever glared on her from the morass. No relief met her eye, save only the stars overhead, which no longer the forget-me-nots of the angels, had like Basil, mended their condition as they grew older, and were now "the thoughts of God in the heavens." At last they fall in with a

Shawnee squaw, who leads them to the spot where Gabriel *had been*; but he, alas, was not there! He had left the place just six days before. In the pathetic words of the poet—

"He had continued his journey."

One would have thought, by this time, Evangeline would have given up the search. But not so. Under the ghostly advice of Father Felician, she stays in this retreat several months, under the idea that her lover will return in the autumn. But he never returned. "Hope deferred makes the heart sick," says the oft quoted poetic axiom, and Evangeline found it but too lamentably true in her own case. To use a huntsman's phrase, she gave up the chase in despair, and retired to Philadelphia, where she spent the remainder of her days as an exemplary Roman Catholic, performing the duties of a sister of mercy, going from house to house, and hovel to hovel, dispensing deeds of charity. The passage is a fine one, and worthy of an attentive perusal. The poem closes with the meeting of the lovers, and the smile of recognition, followed by the immediate death of Gabriel, who passed out of this world, we are informed,

"As when a lamp is blown out by a gust of wind at a casement."

Such is the production which a grave scholar, a man of genius, and ripe years, has, for reasons best known to himself, thought proper to pass off upon the American public, to mould the character, to cultivate and form the *Protestant* morals of twenty millions of human beings. Will the scholars and writers of this nation, who have a pen to wield, or a voice to speak, sit tamely and submit to such an imposition? Will discriminating parents put into the hands of their children such wire-drawn tales, modeled after Goody Two Shoes and Tom Thumb, which, in their clumsy phraseology, set at

defiance all the laws of rhetoric, and in their similes and metaphorical allusions, mingle heaven and earth, sea and air, in one formless chaos? Are we to pass by without ever reading the inscriptions, written in deathless characters, upon the proud monuments of Grecian, Roman, and British fame? Are Homer, Virgil, Horace, Shakespeare, to be set aside as obsolete, as having fallen too far behind the age, to be worthy even the perusal of common readers? Or, are the very laws of thought and feeling, and those which have hitherto governed physical nature, convulsed and changed in the whirl of business and progressive spirit of these restless times? Must we yield every association, sacred to the scholar's heart, to be distorted, while it is blended with the common-place details of what the writer, whether he be authorized or unauthorized, may choose to consider every-day life? Are those playgrounds of the memory, where we have lingered so long, and in the shades of which we spent our childhood, to be bereft of every tree and every fountain? Is there to be no longer an echo from the dell, a breeze from the hill, a spring gushing from beneath the rock? Is that pure love, which warmed the tender breast of Miranda and Desdemona, to give place to slipshod, sentimental stories, told in the style of the nursery, beginning in nothing, and ending in nothing?

"What think ye, a bard 's a mere gossip who tells  
Of the every day feelings of every one else?"

But we are told that these efforts are Acadian, that they are only pastoral, and should be treated as such in our estimation of them. In reply, we say, if these are pastoral, then the Bucolics of Virgil are not; if these are images of rural and sylvan

life, then Shenstone and Burns were not poets. If these productions, issuing from the lazy retreat of some lily-fingered votary, portray human feeling, and the ebings and flowings of human life, whether gentle or simple, then "Scots wha hae wi Wallace bled," "Logan Water," "The Riggs of Barley," and the "Birks of Abersfeldy," are rant and folly, and affectation. For, relating as they do to the same objects in nature and the heart, while differing so totally in their very elements of being, if the one is natural, the other must be factitious. But it may be objected, that every poet is not a Burns. True, indeed; but every poet is, by common consent of mankind, a child, a copyer, a devotee of nature. We complain of the difference, not in degree, but in kind. All these quaint affectations, these stifled emotions and suppressed sentiments, that were called into being for the sole purpose of being strangled and murdered; such spasms, and theatrical flourishes, to express the simplest thing in nature; such a paralysis of passion, upon the plainest matter of fact topic, about which the mind can be occupied, if we may use the language of Dr. Young upon so trivial a subject:

"Resembles ocean, into tempest wrought,  
To waft a feather, or to drown a fly."

We hope and believe that the day is not remote, when, amid the convulsions that attend the old order of things in Europe—our own country, placed high above the reach of these desolating tides—our own country, which has already given the "lyre of heaven another string," will enfold in her embraces at least *one son*, who shall strike the poet's harp, or touch the strings of the lute, with the bold hand or gentle skill of a master.

## HISTORICAL AND STATISTICAL VIEW OF THE WORK- ING OF EMANCIPATION IN JAMAICA.

THE Island of Jamaica is one of the largest of the Antilles, and much the most important of the British West India possessions. It lies between the 17th and 19th degrees of north latitude, and the 76th and 79th degrees of west longitude. It is estimated to contain 6,400 square miles, and is, therefore, about as large as the state of Massachusetts.

The face of the country is extremely diversified. The island rises gently from the sea in extensive savannas, here and there broken, by spurs from a strong central mountain range, which traverses the island, and rises, as it approaches the east end, to the elevation of 7,800 feet. Many of the slopes of the western, and middle sections, are gentle, and surpassingly beautiful; but the mountain scenery of the eastern, is bold, precipitous, and grand. There are few valleys or table lands, the peaks are detached cones, rising in rapid succession, and separated by deep ravines, through which, during the wet seasons, torrents rush with resistless fury. There is seldom a heavy rain unaccompanied by loss of life, at some of the numerous fords of the island, and often at those which are dry for nine months in the year.

The island is rising rapidly from the ocean, and is evidently of recent date. Marine fossils of existing species may be found high up in the interior, many hundred feet above the level of the sea. Limestone is abundant. Trap rocks, and an extinct volcano, are said to exist in the higher mountain region, though Sir T. De la Bache, an eminent English geologist, after a scientific tour, found no evidences of volcanic origin, and pronounced the formation coralline.

The climate is hot, and, in the

plains, sultry; but at an elevation of a few hundred feet, the thermometer seldom indicates a greater degree of heat than 90°, and the nights are comfortably cool. The atmosphere is moist; the dews very heavy; and the mid-day sun, everywhere powerful. The temperature varies with the elevation, and, in the high mountain region, fire is comfortable in the morning and evening for most of the year. Frost, snow, and ice are unknown, except that imported by Mr. Artice of Boston.

The salubrity of the mountain air is not excelled within the tropics; but the general influence upon European constitutions is debilitating.

Since the days of Cromwell, the island has been a dependency of the British crown, and, though many Spanish names are retained, the English language is universally spoken.

This beautiful island, thus briefly introduced to the reader, is the theater of one of the most interesting experiments ever made in behalf of humanity. Its population is somewhat less than half a million of souls, of which, till the year 1834, nine-tenths were African slaves. The staples cultivated by them, were sugar, rum, coffee, ginger, and pimento.

Missionary operations were commenced at an early day among the slaves of Jamaica. In 1754, the Moravians established themselves in the parish of St. Elizabeth's; and in 1789, Dr. Coke, the coadjutor of the venerable Wesley, organized a Methodist mission in the city of Kingston. The missionaries, however, were hated as dissenters, and jealously watched, lest they should manifest sympathy for the negroes. With the greatest difficulty they maintained their position, and so little progress had the missions made, that, in 1816, they had little more

than a nominal existence. Among the earliest religious teachers, was an obscure negro from the state of Georgia, probably a refugee slave during the war of the American Revolution, who, in the latter part of the last century, found his way to the island, and began to preach in the city of Kingston. The early operations of this man, George Lisle, are involved in great obscurity ; it is certain, however, that by his zeal and address he gained ready access to the slaves, despite the efforts of the planters ; for, on the revival of missions in 1816, the sect he had established, known as the "Black Baptists," was found in all parts of the island, and its cardinal principle, immersion, universally regarded as the seal of inevitable salvation. To obviate the evil of his exclusion from the estates, he selected the most intelligent slaves he could find, and gave them messages to their fellows upon the estates. These messengers gathered the people together, often secretly, and by night, and delivered to them the word they had received. In process of time, the messengers became an established order in the church, and were termed "leaders." To a large extent they were the only medium through which the preacher could communicate with the people, and the power they exercised, at first sub-pastoral, soon became an iron despotism over the bodies and souls of their classes. For the most part, they were the drivers, the boatswains, and other prominent slaves on the estate ; always ignorant, and often grossly licentious, brutal men.

Mr. Lisle gave to each person connected with him, a monthly ticket, or small pasteboard card, certifying the nature of the connection, whether as a communicating member, or merely an "inquirer," by which was meant a regular attendant.

These tickets, perhaps an innocent device at first, became engines

of tremendous power in the hands of the leaders ; for, under their tuition, the people came to regard them as passports to heaven, to be obtained at any price, whether of money, virtue, or honesty. It can not be wondered at, that, with such teachers, and such machinery, Christianity assumed the degraded form of a licentious superstition, nearer akin to African heathenism, than to pure and undefiled religion.

In 1817, a new era dawned upon Jamaica. The wars that had desolated Europe had happily terminated. The slave laws had been modified, and a favorable reaction in the religious aspect of the island followed. An active sympathy was awakened among the English dissenters, in behalf of the colonial slaves. Existing missions were strengthened, and the Baptist, Presbyterian, and Independent bodies, successively organized strong missionary operations among them. The missionaries were protected in their persons and labors, by the government ; and, notwithstanding the contempt and obloquy heaped upon them by the planters, they prosecuted their objects with rapidly increasing interest, and influence, among the people. The Baptist missionaries occupied the most prominent position. They had, on their arrival, entered at once into the labors of Mr. Lisle, and they nearly absorbed his followers in their extensive arrangements for covering the ground. They objected to the "leader and ticket" system he had organized, and would have suppressed it, had they hoped for success in the effort ; but it was feared that the attempt would destroy their influence, and disband their churches, they therefore adopted it. It has, no doubt, been very much modified in their hands, yet it is still regarded by the missionaries of all the other bodies as a most malignant element in the religious constitution of the island ; as demoraliz-

zing as it is powerful. It has been the bane of some of the large Baptist churches, and it may yet prove the ruin of all.

In the fall of 1831, there were forty-four dissenting ministers in the island. Cheering success had attended their labors. Many churches had been gathered; some schools established; temporary erections had given place to substantial chapels and residences; the various stations were "lengthening their cords and strengthening their stakes," and religious influences and impressions began to permeate the mass; when, sudden as the lightning's flash, every effort was palsied; churches were scattered; buildings destroyed, and the labors of years apparently annihilated.

In the year 1830, the free colored population had, after a violent struggle, wrung from an unwilling legislature, the concession of equal rights. Soon after, a report was extensively circulated among the slaves that the king had set them free; but that the planters, like the Egyptian Pharaoh, had refused to let them go. They resolved to strike for liberty. An insurrection was organized, and so wisely and secretly conducted, that it was not even suspected, till the fatal night on which the torch was applied, and the whole northwest district of the island was illuminated by blazing cane-fields, and sugar-works. Martial law was proclaimed, and the miserable negroes were butchered by hundreds. Few whites were slain, but upwards of six millions of dollars' worth of property was destroyed by the insurgents. In the frenzy of the moment, the missionaries were denounced as the authors of the rebellion. Vengeance demanded its sacrifice; and, in turn, the planters became incendiaries. They madly fired the chapels and dwellings of the missionaries, and thus added to the destruction more than two hundred thousand dollars worth of mission property. On the

resumption of power by the civil authorities, they immediately instituted an investigation into the causes of the rebellion, which, however unsatisfactory, fully exonerated the missionaries and their churches, from any participation in it. It is worthy of remark, however, that it broke out in a district extensively influenced by missionary agencies, and in the very midst of mission churches.

Both parties appealed to the mother country. The issue was fairly made up, that dissenting missions to the slaves must be abandoned, or slavery must cease, and a verdict was demanded of the British public. The demonstration of their essential antagonism was complete, and the appeal moved the whole empire. On the part of the planting interests there was a tremendous array of wealth, talent, and influence; but the moral sense of the nation was aroused, and truth triumphed. On the 22d September, 1833, the Imperial Parliament passed the Emancipation Act, by which all the negro slaves in the British colonies, came into an apprenticeship state on the 1st August, 1834, to continue, in the case of the domestic slaves, till 1st August, 1838, and of the field slaves, till 1st August, 1840, at which periods they severally became absolutely free. The bill granted the option of immediate emancipation to those colonies whose legislatures should elect it, but all chose the apprenticeship, except the small Islands of Antigua and Bermuda, which, as subsequent events have clearly shown, wisely preferred the alternative.

It also granted an indemnity of twenty millions sterling to the planters; not, as has sometimes been represented, as the purchase price of the slaves, but to reimburse them for any losses they should sustain by the operation of the act. The intermediate system worked badly. It was the source of endless heart-burnings and bitterness, and more

than once called forth stringent and stinging despatches and regulations from the Colonial Office. The negro hoped for freedom. The new system mocked him with the name, while it wrung from him ten hours of unrequited toil, daily. The planters wanted unpaid labor, and it mocked them with the promise, while it wrenched from their grasp the slave whip, by which alone they could coerce it. This unnatural state fretted every one sore ; and as the experiment of freeing them in classes was regarded as hazardous, if not dangerous, it was resolved by all parties, to relinquish to the field slaves two years of their servitude, and let all go out free on 1st August, 1838.

The advent of unconditional freedom was anticipated by the different classes, with the intensest emotions of fear, hope and joy. It was ushered in by voices of devout thanksgiving and praise, and was marked by all the order of a solemn festival. Not a voice was raised in riot ; not an arm nerved by revenge. It was a sacred sabbatical jubilee.

A revolution such as that which has passed upon Jamaica must develope its tendencies and influences in the generations which follow, rather than in those which witness it. The degrading superstitions, habits, and usages of the slaves, may be modified in the present generation, but they can be eradicated only by the continuous efforts of successive ages ; yet ten years have elapsed since the advent of unrestricted freedom, and we may reasonably enquire after the results that have thus far been attained.

Under the old system, the whole slave population were held to labor for the supply of the British market. They were producers only. Hence, the tabular returns from the customs, indicated the amount of labor performed, and measured the pros-

perity of the island. Unhappily the new system has been judged by the same tests. The successful or adverse working of the emancipation, is made identical with the increase or diminution of the number of hogsheads of sugar, puncheons of rum, and bags of coffee, ginger, and pimento, shipped to England. And still more unhappily, it has been complicated with other influences adverse to the prosperity of the island, and the disastrous results of all, have been laid to the account of emancipation. The staple exports have greatly decreased. Property has ruinously depreciated ; and of course the agricultural and financial interests of the island have been extremely embarrassed ; there have been many failures, and much distress : all this is unquestionably true, —and because it has in the order of time occurred subsequently to the emancipation, it is presumed that it has wrought all this ruin, and that the emancipated classes are idle and lazy, refusing to work, and utterly unworthy the blessings conferred upon them.

The sugar cultivation is the great interest of the island. The sugar estates, (merely called "estates" in contradistinction to coffee properties called "properties,") are very large, and have heretofore been very valuable. They lie along the savannas, and vallies and gentle hill sides of the island. Near the center, are the "works," embracing the "great house," the proprietor's residence—the "basha's (overseer's) house," the "boiling house," "curing house," "mill" (for expressing the cane juice), "trash house," and distillery. The drainings from the curing house, the dregs from the boiling house, and the sweets from immature, injured, or rat eaten canes, with an indefinite amount of filth, tobacco juice, dead mice, rats, &c., are turned into the "rum well," and are manufactured into the "rum crop," at the distillery.

Coffee is the next great agricultural interest. Its cultivation is confined to the mountains, and is necessarily conducted almost exclusively by manual labor. No machinery has yet been found, materially to facilitate or cheapen the cultivation. Cleaning the fields, pruning the trees, and picking the berries, constitute the great labor of a coffee property, and it is very doubtful whether machinery can be applied to any of these purposes. If it can not, those properties that cultivate the medium and common qualities of coffee, must cease operations.

The coffee grown in different sections of the Island, varies very much in quality and in value, though the expense of cultivation is very nearly the same. Jamaica coffee, in the Liverpool market, ranges from 40s. to 150s. per 100 lbs. It follows, that whilst the "common" and "medium" qualities can only be raised at a ruinous loss, those in the more favorable districts, as the Port Royal, and St. George's mountains, may still yield handsome returns. Perhaps one-third of the coffee cultivated in the island quotes as "fine," and is thus placed beyond the influences that ruin those properties that raise the inferior qualities.

The ginger and pimento interests, are comparatively of minor importance. They have not attracted much attention, and their exports have nearly sustained themselves.

How far the sugar and coffee cultivation have been affected by the emancipation itself, it is impossible to decide. Certainly not to any considerable extent. A small and perhaps a permanent decrease would seem to be a natural result.

The producers under the old system, have become consumers under the new; and allowing each to have added fifteen pounds of sugar to the consumption during slavery, there have been annually consumed in the island nearly 30,000 hogsheads of

sugar, which had slavery continued, would have been added to the exports. This estimate is doubtless within the truth. The negroes purchase sugar at the shops to a considerable extent, and every householder raises a little cane, and has his own primitive cane press. It is also true that in many instances ingenuity and enterprise have cut out for themselves new channels, and much labor performed, has become capital investment, yielding its annual returns to the freedmen. It follows that a decrease in the exports fails to indicate a decrease in the crops raised, or in the amount of labor performed.

During the first years of the emancipation, the questions of rent and wages caused much bad feeling. The negroes were ignorant, and often surly and jealous. The planters were exacting, and not unfrequently haughty and tyrannical. Here and there, estates suffered their whole crops to perish, rather than pay the laborers thirty-one cents per day to gather them. For this reason many thousand acres of canes rotted on the ground in the year 1839. But these difficulties, incident to the great change, were in their nature, temporary, and in the course of a few years were removed, except in solitary instances of great perverseness; and the mutual relations and dependences of employers and laborers were becoming manifest, and began to influence the deportment of all parties. Hope brightened over the future, and had no disastrous foreign influences touched the island, it would have moved steadily and rapidly onward in commercial and agricultural improvement, notwithstanding the folly occasionally displayed now by the planters, and anon by the peasantry. But such was not its destiny. A series of calamities has fallen upon it, in the very incipiency of the new order of things, which, occurring at the period of its great-

est prosperity, would have crushed its energies, and ruined its estates. These have been—

1. The financial revulsion that swept over Europe and America in the year 1837, 8, which reached the island in the first hours of the emancipation, and did its work of ruin there as elsewhere.

2. The emancipation threw a multitude of new buyers into the market, and the spirit of competition suddenly awakened, induced excessive overtrading in all departments. In the midst of this, and heightened by it, came the financial crisis of 1842, which also swept over Europe and America.

3. These embarrassments were greatly aggravated by the loss of a very extensive and lucrative traffic, with the States of Central America. Kingston was the principal entrepot for the traffic of England with these states, but the disturbances in Venezuela, Ecuador, New Grenada, &c., paralyzed it, and in the hour of greatest need, locked up many thousands due to the Jamaica merchants.

4. Hardly had the system of slavery yielded to the powerful attacks of the English abolitionists, ere the enormous protection it had enjoyed, was menaced by them. The colonial system of England was a stupendous structure, by which she at the same time protected her dependences, and encouraged her manufactures. The colonies had the monopoly of the home market for all their productions. No foreigner was permitted to undersell them there; and the English manufacturers had the colonial markets for their commodities—no stranger could intermeddle with them there. This system could only be maintained by enormous external protections, and by internal equalizing duties. Under it, the sugar and coffee of the West Indies was not only protected against foreign competition, but against these productions of the East Indian colonies, so

far as to equalize the prices in the British market. The first effort of the lovers of cheap sugar and coffee in England, was against the differential duty between the East and West Indies. They soon carried this point, to the dismay of the planters, who fiercely and angrily contested every inch of ground. The result was an immense increase in the sugar importation from the East Indies. Success emboldened the assailants, and they turned their batteries against the main fortress. England was paying twenty cents per pound for sugar for which the rest of the world were paying from six to ten cents. The free traders roused the people to demand relief, and their voices prevailed. Sir Robert Peel, yet a protectionist, introduced a new principle of discrimination—that between free and slave grown sugars. It was thought that from 80,000 to 100,000 tons of free sugar from various parts, might find their way to the English market, if it were opened to it; he therefore proposed and carried a reduction of the existing duty of 63 shillings per 100 pounds, to 23s. 9d. when levied upon free sugars, the production of foreign countries. At the same time the duty levied upon colonial sugars was reduced from 24s. per 100 pounds to 14s. 9d., leaving a differential duty of 9s. in favor of the colonies, instead of 39s. which they had enjoyed during slavery. This bill brought the planters into competition with the free sugars of the Mediterranean, and of the East Indies, but it protected them against the slaves of Cuba, Brazil, and Louisiana. It was passed in 1845, and Sir Robert Peel, then supposed to be firmly seated in power, pledged himself for its maintenance. The gloomy fears and discontent excited by the protracted discussion, was in some measure dissipated; the sugar cultivation that had been periled by it, began to look up, canes were extensively put in, and many estates

just ceasing operations were revived. But the free traders rejected the premier's discrimination, and demanded radical measures. They had paid to the planters an indemnity of twenty millions sterling, and they demanded cheap sugar in return. They were irresistible as the people of England always are when they demand parliamentary action, and the Peel ministry resigned. Lord John Russell succeeded, and his first act was the equalization of the duties on all foreign sugars, and the adoption of a sliding scale of duties, by which in 1850, every vestige of protection will pass away, and foreign sugars will be admitted upon the same terms as colonial.

The inevitable result of this legislation is to throw the estates of the British colonies out of cultivation, and in consequence to depreciate their value. The same influences in a manufacturing district, whose operations were sustained by a high protective tariff, would produce precisely analogous results, silencing the spindles, rendering worthless the machinery, and ruining the companies.

It has been asked: If free labor is cheaper than slave labor, why can not the free laborers of Jamaica raise sugar as cheap as the slaves of Cuba and Brazil? Simply because there is no equality between the cases. Jamaica freemen can and do raise sugar as cheap as they did when slaves, probably cheaper; and this is all the proposition demands.

The enormous protection of ten cents per pound for their sugar, while it enabled the planters to realize immense returns from their estates, led them to sink very large sums in permanent works, and gave to their property an entirely fictitious value. This value it has retained during the ages of the colonial system. Free trade has subverted that system. Its protection is gone, and the colonial property is thrown into the market of the world;

its inherent value alone remains; its fictitious value passes away with the system which gave it birth. Yet the present proprietors look for returns proportioned to the ancient cost and estimated worth of their estates, and they are embarrassed, perhaps ruined if they can not realize them. Sugar estates can find no sale. Many of the largest have ceased cultivation, and many mortgagees have offered to give up their mortgages for twenty-five per cent. of the amounts secured by them.

5. The agricultural interests of the island have been still further embarrassed by a succession of most untoward "seasons," as the periodical spring and fall rains are called. Probably no equal period in the history of Jamaica can compare with the years 1840, 1, 3, 4. That there has been a change in the atmospheric phenomena of the island within the last twenty-five or thirty years, seems unquestionable. The resistless and desolating tornadoes and hurricanes, which until within that period have occasionally swept over it, are now unknown. They still prevail in the Caribbean sea, but their track lies further to the westward than formerly. How far this change may have influenced or modified the dry and rainy seasons, it is impossible to say. That they are changed, to the astonishment of the old inhabitants, and to the amusing wonder of the old negroes, is certainly true.

6. The extreme difficulty of obtaining funds for the cultivation of their estates has pressed with great force against the planters. Large funds are requisite for current expenses, and for the introduction of such machinery as the new state of the island has rendered necessary. And as the ordinary resources of the planters have failed, it has become necessary to appeal largely to the capitalists of England. But their confidence was shaken by the reiterated cries of "ruin," raised by

the planters during the first years of emancipation ; and though money has generally been abundant in England at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. the bankers have been unwilling, upon any terms, to negotiate paper upon securities which the holders themselves pronounced valueless. There is every reason to fear that those cries, then so fictitious, may be sadly verified by the free trade principles of Lord John Russell.

7. The enormous increase of governmental expenditure, and consequent weight of taxation, oppress all the interests of the island, and forbid prosperity.

The population of the island has been stated at nearly 500,000 souls, nine-tenths of which are laboring peasantry, and the taxation, direct and indirect, annually wrung out of it, is more than two millions of dollars ! one-third the value of all the exports of the island. Not less than three hundred thousand dollars are appropriated to the purposes of the state-paid church. The Governor's salary is

**\$40,000**

The Receiver General's

(Treasurer,) 21,500

Chief Justice's, 17,500

Bishop's, 15,000

Associate Justices', each, 12,500

Archdeacon's, 10,000

with a long list of dignitaries in church and state, whose salaries and perquisites amount to \$5,000 and upwards.

In attributing the prostration of Jamaica in a great degree to the free trade principles of England, no odium is cast upon them ; so far as relates to the sugar and coffee cultivation, the question was at least one of time, if not of principle. The transition could have been gradual, and have extended over a series of years, thus allowing time for the planter to adapt himself to his new circumstances, and for the laborers to acquire ease and skill in the use of their new implements. Such a course would have modified the ruin

that a rapid bolt from the extreme of protection to absolute free trade has wrought.

Though the large estates have so greatly depreciated in value, property in small lots has been very much in demand. The freedmen have been anxious to obtain small freeholds, and many old properties that during slavery were almost worthless, have been broken up and sold in lots of a few acres each, at very advanced prices.

Having explained the causes which have induced the present depression in Jamaica, we will trace the emancipation in its prominent social and moral bearings and influences.

During slavery, the resources of the island were unknown. Save in the cultivation of the staples, nothing had been done to develop them ; and the protection they enjoyed, induced an extravagant and wasteful incidental expenditure, with the most negligent and thrifless modes of culture. The cultivation of the soil was carried on, almost exclusively, by means of the hoe, the cutlass, and the human brute. Ploughs, harrows, spades, shovels, wheel and handbarrows, were almost unknown. Now, this primitive mode is as far as possible dispensed with. Wherever the means have been available, machinery has been substituted for manual labor, and uniformly with the happiest results. Ploughs of various kinds, harrows, hoe-harrows, cultivators, barrows, spades, shovels, &c. &c., with steam-engines instead of breeze and cattle mills, and the generous use of manures, with improvements in the boiling department, are becoming quite common ; and here and there, train-roads for the transportation of the canes, are laid on the estates of the more wealthy proprietors. The first introduction of the various implements of husbandry, and machinery, has been very expensive, as it has been necessary to import, not only the im-

plements themselves, but men to use and smiths to repair them. Hillside estates, upon which they can not be used, and those that have not been able to incur the expense of their introduction, are compelled to adhere to the old system, under modified forms, and therefore labor under peculiar embarrassments.

Not a few of the overseers resisted the substitution of machinery for manual culture, and the negroes generally regarded it with aversion. But by the efforts of the agricultural society, and the establishment of ploughing matches in the various parishes, they are becoming familiar with them, and many are acquiring ease and skill in their use. Already the expense of cultivating the cane, and of manufacturing sugar, has been greatly reduced, not less than fifty per cent. upon the more favored estates, and yet there is large room for improvement.

Several very valuable implements of tropical agriculture have been invented by scientific and ingenious mechanics, and investigation and experiment are still vigorously pushed in this direction, with prospect of yet more favorable results. This spirit has been stimulated and sustained by a very efficient General Agricultural Society, which, in the prosecution of its objects, has already awarded several premiums of £100 each.

Other items that may be traced to the activity and enterprise excited by the emancipation, are—

The establishment of steam communication round the entire island :

The construction of several good turnpike roads :

The widening, and general improvement of the roads, throughout the island :

The construction of railroad communication from Kingston westward, more than, twenty miles of which have been completed.

The organization of several banking and mining companies; of a

life insurance company; a silk company, and one for supplying the city of Kingston with water.

The silk company has proved a failure; and the mining languish for want of skill and enterprise to prosecute them, though the ore yields a good per centum of pure copper.

The legislation in reference to the blacks, under the old system, was necessarily cruel. It contemplated them as slaves, and made the pecuniary profit of the planter, the highest end of their being. They were over-burdened with the most onerous exactions, whilst they enjoyed the least possible protection. All this has passed away. The same parties control the local legislature, but their spirit is changed. A system of legislation in many respects preposterous and burdensome, has been marked by many beneficent provisions. Among these may be mentioned: The substitution of the penitentiary system, for the old slave prisons, and the erection of a large, substantial penitentiary, embracing all the modern improvements in that department of philanthropy; which, under the direction of a most excellent inspector, and the constant attendance of the chaplain and schoolmaster, has already affected the records of crime, and greatly lessened the recommitments;

The erection, on a most liberal and enlightened plan, of a large lunatic asylum, in the stead of the wretched "crazy house" of the days of slavery:

The extension of medical aid, advice and medicines to every person of the laboring class, upon the payment of \$1.50 per annum, or, upon the recommendation of any respectable person, if they are unable to pay that fee. For this purpose the island is districted, and a salaried physician with a dispensary is placed in each district:

The organization of a board of education, through which, irrespective of denominational distinctions,

education may be disseminated through the island. The pecuniary embarrassments of the island render it impossible to make this board as efficient as it was hoped it would be, at its inception, and it may be confined mainly to the establishment and support of a normal school, for several years to come.

The most obnoxious feature in the legislation since emancipation, has been the pertinacious determination of the Assembly to introduce foreign laborers, for the purpose of *reducing the price of labor.*

The clamor for labor, that has been raised, has not been in consequence of the refusal of the laborers to work, but of the refusal of the planters to pay them their price. The market value of labor has been from 1s. 8d. to 1s. 6d. per diem, for able bodied men, and the planters have not been able to pay this price and cultivate their estates to a profit; and when they have endeavored to reduce the price, the negroes have left the estates cultivation, and devoted themselves to the improvement of their own provision grounds. Many hundred thousand dollars have been expended in successive attempts to introduce the Irish, the English, the Coolies, and the Africans. These efforts have been without benefit to the island, and have been most disastrous to the European and Coolie emigrants. Most of the former have fallen victims to field labor under a tropical sun, or to intemperance. The Coolies, after a few thousands have been introduced, are found unfit for the labor required. They are heathen, of a foreign tongue and color, and can not amalgamate with the negroes, who reject and despise them. They wander about the island, objects of commiseration and of charity, and it is hoped will ere long be sent back to their native India.

It has been stated by some partisan anti-slavery presses, that the emancipation has been without ben-

eficial effects upon the white population of the island, who are occasionally represented as possessing the most malignant feelings of hatred towards the negroes, whom they strive by every means in their power to degrade and oppress. Such representations are gratuitous, unjust and cruel.

Undoubtedly there are those who would welcome with joy the re-establishment of slavery, if it could be accomplished peaceably, though they do not, dare not say so. Such is the public sentiment in even the most conservative classes, that the expression of such wishes and feelings would be received with marks of displeasure, if not of disgust. There are many who disesteem the negroes, and under-estimate their capacity; but the mass of the white population manifest a kindly interest in their welfare and progressive improvement, quite as much as is manifested towards the laboring classes of England. Indeed it has become their interest to cultivate this feeling, and they avail themselves of every opportunity to give expression to it; accordingly we find testimonies to the quiet, order, and improvement of the negroes, in the governmental despatches, in the legislative debates, in the charges of judges, the presentments of juries, and in the meetings of planters in every part of the island.

The recent disturbances in the island can scarcely be regarded as exceptions to these remarks, so perfectly adapted to produce them, have their causes been. The free trade action of Parliament excited such disaffection among the planters, that in their various meetings they loudly and foolishly talked of being absolved from allegiance to a government that would not protect them, and went so far as to speak of independence, and of annexation to the United States. Now the negroes are loyal to a man. They know that, as they express it, the Queen

made them free, and that the planters resisted the emancipation. They know too that there are three millions of negro slaves in the United States, and they commiserate their condition. They do not appreciate the causes of the embarrassments and irritation of the planters, and putting together the few facts within their knowledge, they naturally regard the discussions of the planters as somehow connected with their subjugation, and perhaps re-enslavement. The planters, in many instances, have not been able to pay current expenses as they became due; hence many estates have become indebted to their laborers for several months wages, in some cases, for a much longer period. The fears of the negroes have quickened their applications for these arrears, and they have been resisted by the planters indebted, from sheer inability. This refusal to pay them, has formed a final fact with the negroes, who connect it with the discussions, and see in it the fulfillment of their fears. In these cases they have refused to work further, and manifest a spirit of turbulence and insubordination, which has disquieted the districts in which they have taken place, but have not yet resulted in any rebellion against the law. How far this will proceed, depends very much upon the kindness, fairness, and firmness of the governor.

The white population generally are not religiously disposed: they live under a tropical sun, and many of them are men of irritable temper and violent passion, and when excited, they express themselves strongly. They do not forget that until recently the negroes were their slaves, and they, their masters; nor do we wish to represent them as particularly kind and amiable and forbearing; but it is due to them as a matter of right, to testify to their greatly improved deportment towards those who ten years ago were their slaves.

Prior to the emancipation, concubinage was well nigh universal. Marriage was almost unknown, even among the higher classes of the island. Public sentiment quite forbade the marriage of overseers, and the loss of place and caste was the penalty which usually followed a disregard of its mandate. The overseers hold office at the mere pleasure of the attorneys of the estates, and are liable to be superseded at any time, and without a moment's warning. We know of quite a number who on communicating their marriage to their attorneys, received such replies as, "Your services are no longer required;" "Be prepared to leave the estate on the day of your marriage;" "Your successor is appointed, get some other employment," &c. There was an advantage in perpetuating this state of things during slavery. The overseers, by their licentious intercourse with the female slaves, had opportunities of watching and ascertaining the first rising of a spirit of discontent and insubordination, and when and how, most efficiently to strike it down. It is not wonderful that in such a state of society, the most gross and revolting usages should grow up, and the most loathsome scenes sometimes be enacted. They have passed away—let their memory rot.

Hand in hand with licentiousness went intemperance, and Sabbath desecration, till the day of sacred rest had become transformed into the great day of revelry. Undoubtedly there were gentlemen connected with the island, to whom these remarks would not apply; but they were comparatively rare, and themselves fell under the odium of the public sentiment. So entirely vitiated had the moral sense of society become, that these vices were not merely tolerated, they were justified. An intelligent, well read gentleman, has addressed an elaborate argument to us, showing the scriptural

authority and justification of concubinage. Forsooth, it was a patriarchal institution!

No results of the emancipation have been more emphatic, or more auspicious, than the reformation in the morals and habits of the white population, and the establishment of a higher tone of public sentiment among them. Marriage is now honorable. It has been encouraged by the example of many of the leading gentlemen of the island, and by the insertion of a "de facto" clause in the "marriage act" of the island, in virtue of which, parties living in concubinage, who should be married under its provisions, are regarded in law, as having been married from the commencement of the connection, and all their issue are declared legitimate.

Married overseers are now preferred to single ones, from the moral standing which it gives them with the negroes, and though they have not been able to change the miserable tenure by which they hold office, which is, in itself, an almost insuperable objection to their marriage; yet many have availed themselves of the provisions of the de facto clause, and have become married men. There is no positive disgrace attached to living in concubinage, either among the higher or lower classes; and not a few may be found moving freely in the best circles of society, who are living thus; yet it is regarded as a state that belongs to the past, and incompatible with the relations and duties introduced by freedom.

The drinking habits of the white population are very greatly improved. There is much less of drunkenness, less hard-drinking, less tippling, than there used to be. This is true of all, but emphatically so of the largest class of the white population, the overseers. A gentleman extensively acquainted with them, and familiar with their convivial usages for many years, remarked to

us that the great reformation in their drinking habits, was one of the most gratifying influences of the new state of things. Under slavery, such a reform was impossible. The overseers could not resist the influences by which their office was surrounded. Invariably, and almost of necessity, they became hard drinkers, and multitudes of them have been cut down in the morning of life, by the rum of their distilleries, whilst their parents in England have ignorantly attributed their decease to the harmless and delicious fruits of the tropics. The responsibilities and duties of overseers occupy much more of their time and attention than formerly. They have not now the leisure for social, and hence not the temptation to private drinking they then had, and the intemperance that then excited only a smile, would not now be tolerated. The practice of some of the leading gentry of the island approximates primitive temperance, eschewing the stronger liquors, they cleave only to the wine cup. These tokens of improvement are quite disconnected from any direct temperance movement. Such efforts are viewed with great contempt in its application to themselves, and are regarded as only fitting for the debased peasantry.

The Sabbath is generally respected, so far as to induce abstinence from the occupations of life; the stores are closed, and all business ceases. There is also a greatly increased attendance of whites at the churches of "the establishment" generally. Few whites are connected with the dissenting chapels; they are not regarded as genteel! Other vices, kindred to licentiousness and intemperance, that were rife during slavery, are becoming discreditable, and are receding from the public eye.

In reference to color, the population is divided into three classes; the whites, the brown, and the black. Under the old régime, the white and

brown classes were free ; the blacks, slaves. The whites were the privileged class. Bad as morals were among them, the ties of nature were not utterly disregarded. The blood of the master seldom flowed in the veins of the slave. By a silent acquiescence, the law of slavery was revised, so far that the colored children of the planters followed the condition of the father, and were free. The sons became clerks and small shop-keepers ; the daughters, concubines of their father's friends. They could rise no higher. In process of time, brown men accumulated property ; others became the heirs of their affectionate or repentant parents, who not unfrequently sent a favorite son to the English Universities for an education ; at length, growing too powerful to be kept under, they demanded, and after a fearful struggle, which needed but the first blow, to bathe the island in blood, they obtained for themselves equal rights, eight years before the emancipation conferred them upon the blacks.

The progress of this class has been very rapid. Immediately after their enfranchisement, two of their number were returned to the local legislature, and others have been added at each successive election, until about one-third of the whole representation is by colored members.

The prejudice that began to yield in 1830, by the concession of political rights, has receded, even more rapidly than those under its ban have advanced. No doubt it lingers in the breasts of many planters, modified, not eradicated ; but it would be regarded as low and vulgar, and most impolitic, to give expression to it, or to be influenced by it in any of the courtesies and reciprocities of social life. The remembrance of the past has its painful associations for the brown man, as well as for the white, though they lie in a different direction ; and

VOL. VI.

72

it is not easy to determine which is the more unwilling to yield. These two classes mingle indiscriminately in social and political parties ; in public and in private, at all places, in all offices and professions ; and receive from the government precisely the same consideration.

The black population have enjoyed civil rights only since the emancipation, and though some of them were free before, they are without men of large possessions, or of cultivated minds ; hence their color is not represented in the learned professions, nor in the colonial legislature. The general feeling towards them, is that of the higher classes towards the lower, and is, to a great extent, quite irrespective of complexional distinctions.

The negroes are confiding and clannish, and will cluster round the man of their choice ; but once excited, they are suspicious in the extreme, and will manifest a prejudice against both the other classes, and particularly the brown, far stronger than is felt against themselves. An appeal to their prejudices by one of their number, is never without its effect, notwithstanding the earnest disclaimers, it always elicits from both whites and browns.

The physical condition of the Jamaica slaves was superior to that of the slaves in our southern states. They cultivated their own provision grounds, which were provided by law, and examined by a governmental inspector ; and starvation, or hunger, for any length of time, was unknown among them. So, also, were the unnatural modes of punishment sometimes resorted to at the south, as murders, maimings, brandings, gun-shot wounds, &c. &c. Yet they were subject to stripes, and stock, and tread-mills, and bore a yoke that throttled them at every step.

Their social and moral state was frightful. There is nothing at the south to compare with it, except it

may be found on individual and isolated plantations. The negroes were thrown together upon the estates to the number, often, of five or six hundred, without any other elevating influences than those exerted by the overseer; they learned from him only the vices of civilization, whilst the heathenism of the original Africans was transmitted to their children.

The recent influence of missions had softened their terrible and disgusting degradation at some points; yet the masses were little less than semi-heathen, when, in 1834, the whole field was thrown open to the elevating influences of the gospel.

The slaves of the south are in the midst of large white communities, amongst whom the institutions of religion are more or less sustained; and aside from any individual instruction they may receive, they are under an indirect elevating influence, and are receiving an incidental education, from the surrounding white population, of immense value, and which, in the course of generations, has greatly improved their language, changed their domestic and social usages, modified their superstitions, given them some idea of religion, and much enlarged the field of their general knowledge.

The extreme degradation of the peasantry of Jamaica has been a stumbling block to nearly all transient visitors. They have inferred that, as slaves, they were upon a par with those of the south; and when, after several years of liberty, they find them much more ignorant and debased than the American slaves, they leap at the conclusion that they are relapsing to barbarism, and that emancipation has proved a curse to them. They then publish their convictions, as the testimony of eye-witnesses, for the benefit of pseudo-philanthropists.

The emancipation opened before the masses, whom it delivered, a new and unexplored world. It took

them from among the beasts of the field, and restoring to them their humanity, bade them "strive." They have striven, many of them nobly, and though their progress has been marred and hindered by the deep, dark degradation of their brute life, and by external, adverse circumstances, it has yet been more rapid, more encouraging, and more profoundly peaceful than the most sanguine could reasonably have anticipated.

The city of Kingston is the commercial center of the island; and the most vicious and idle portion of the peasantry—those who, during slavery, were distributed upon the estates, and their crimes punished by the driver's lash—naturally determine to it; these are found in the lower part of the city, lounging about the wharves, seeking employment, or petty plunder. They often assume airs of independence and insolence towards those who employ them, and live—no one knows how, nor where. The same class of persons are found in the same localities, in all maritime cities, though not so abundantly in the higher latitudes, as within the tropics. They fill one with shame for his race, and with wonder, at the depth of human degradation. Captains of vessels come in contact with these persons, and often employ them—sometimes to their cost. They are the only specimens they see of the peasantry, and they regard them as fair representatives of the agricultural laborers, with whom their complexion associates them. On their return, they communicate their disgust to the news-boat, or to an enquiring editor, and another, perhaps, well-meant testimony of an eye witness, is given to the world.

The whole rural population have homes. For the most part, they live in the same places, and, perhaps, in the same huts, in which slavery left them. These are very low, small, rude tenements, of from

ten feet square, divided into two rooms, to fourteen feet by twenty-four, divided into three or four. The posts of the house are fastened into the earth, which is slightly raised, and beaten hard for a floor; the sides are made of bamboo, cut and split to the size of laths, which is daubed or plastered with mud, on one side or both, and rubbed till smooth and hard; and by successive rubbings, and filling up the cracks, this process makes a neat firm wall. The roof is thatched with long grass, or with the leaves of the cocoa-nut tree: it is often a foot thick, reaching nearly down to the ground. The under surface is smoked to a glossy black, to protect it from the vermin with which the island abounds.

Many thousand huts have been built since emancipation, and they are uniformly better than the slave huts; higher, larger, better ventilated. A few are boarded up, more are shingled, and many are floored. All manifest an improved taste, style, and manner of living. About twenty thousand of the peasantry have become freeholders. Not only have the people homes, they have the means of a comfortable subsistence. Every man and woman, and half-grown child, has a provision ground, in which they cultivate yams, cocoas, (a root somewhat resembling a beet, but of a much finer, firmer texture,) plantains, sugar-cane, cassada, coffee, corn, beans, &c. &c., which they sell or barter for bread, biscuit, butter, sugar, cheese, lard, fish, meats, soap, candles, &c. The importations of these articles, since the emancipation, has increased from four to fifty fold. Besides their provision grounds, which they cultivate in the afternoon after 4 o'clock, and on Saturdays, the bulk of the laborers, when they can obtain work, labor upon the estates, from three to five days in the week, for which they receive from 25 cents to 37½

cents per diem of ten hours, from 6 A. M. till 4 P. M., with an intermission of one hour at noon. This enables them to procure lands, horses, mules, donkeys, tables, chairs, bedsteads, bedding, trunks, a little crockery of various sizes and patterns—for they love variety—and occasionally a good wardrobe, to say nothing of several changes of decent white apparel to put into it, the best of which is only seen at marriages, communion seasons, and such special occasions. These new gettings, are all in an humble way; yet they are so general, that nearly every family has a beast, many have several; and nearly every hut in the island is more or less adorned with some of these indications of incipient civilization. This superior manner of living, is only an approximation towards that found among the colored population of the free states, if the squalid misery of our cities may be excepted.

The inferior artisans are all of the emancipated classes. There are many cases of individual enterprise among them. Some have accumulated a little property, and many possess a good business. As their property increases, they acquire the elective franchise, the tenure of which is the payment of £3 taxes per annum, or a salary of £15 per annum, or a house rent of £10 per annum. These are, for the most part, freeholders, and they constitute the most hopeful nucleus of the middle classes of society. When they shall become sufficiently intelligent and powerful to control the elections, we may hope for efficient retrenchment and reform in the governmental expenditure.

The progress of the peasantry in domestic and social improvement has not kept pace with the acquisition of the substantial means of living. The most difficult and tedious department of reform, is that which passing by the outer man, penetrates the heart, and eradicates the preju-

dices and superstitions of degraded life ; purifies and refines the associations that cling around the domestic hearth ; and induces an intelligent appreciation of the relations and duties of husband and wife, parent and child.

Licentiousness was universal among the Jamaica slaves. Men, women and children were abandoned to it. This has been greatly checked by the substitution of marriage for concubinage, yet it is still common for young girls to become unmarried mothers. They lose no standing by it among their neighbors, nor does it offer the slightest impediment to any future matrimonial engagement. Much has been gained by establishing the legal relationship. As a general fact, it is a question of convenience. The woman wants some one to "dig her yams," the man, some one to "boil his pot," and wash his clothes. They both want a friend to take care of them when sick, and to bury them when dead ; in these responsibilities they are mutually agreed, and the instincts of nature draw them together. Love has as little to do with the matter, as if the traffic had been in their breadstuffs, instead of their persons. The consent of parents, of grandmothers, and above all of "god-mothers," is requisite. It was the custom for parties to live together after they were affianced, that they might be sure they were suited, before it was too late, and the final knot was tied ; but this practice, though not uncommon, is gradually becoming so. Husbands and wives frequently rent and cultivate different "grounds," keep separate purses, and defend their rights against each other as rigidly as against strangers. As may be anticipated, the weaker party often suffers—and the minister is not unfrequently called upon to settle quarrels between them, and sometimes to protect the wife from the inflictions of her husband.

It must not be inferred that the people live together unhappily ; not at all. They move along without much friction, naturally accommodating themselves to the customs of the island, and their views of the relationship. In very many instances a mutual attachment grows up after the marriage, which softens their habits, and associations, and sheds its fragrance on their lives.

It can not be expected that the children of such marriages should be properly trained, or that affection should be the main spring of family government. Discipline is administered at the prompting of passion, in the most summary manner, and in the most primitive forms. The degradation of the parent lives in the child, except as it may be modified by external agencies, and influences. The home influence is the most fatal obstacle to the educational effort in the island, and often neutralizes the best exertions of the teacher.

To these general statements there are delightful exceptions at all the mission stations. These show to the missionary what the mass may be, and cheer and aid him in his work ; but in comparison of the whole they are the few.

The slaves were of necessity servile and crouching, and when flattered by their masters, or selected as favorites, became fawning sycophants. The emancipation has broken this spell of power, and the reaction has been so great that the laborers often maintain their cause with a degree of bluntness and firmness, that seems to be, and sometimes is, insolence ; and occasionally they manifest a petulance and excitement extremely improper. They are subject to overwhelming bursts of passion, during which they are entirely uncontrollable, and give utterance to the most wild and frenzied ravings. We have seen such. But when reason has regained her sway, they have not been unwilling

to know their wrong, nor slow to ask forgiveness, except when designing men had wrought upon their prejudices, or excited their suspicions.

The language spoken is a very rude and broken patois ; the articulation is so indistinct, and so very rapid, that persons unacquainted with the dialect would not understand one word in ten used in ordinary conversation. In the schools the children acquire the habit of slow, distinct enunciation, and thus the language is gradually approximating the standard English. The following speeches by a couple of ploughmen, at a recent ploughing match, are very fine illustrations of the language in common use.

"Dis is de day ob rejoice. I feel happy to hab de powa to peak. I hope all de estate may prospa, an God bless de plantas ob Jamaiké. We mus put han an hart togedder, peshally now in dis berry potlicka time, when de property no da pay de owna ; but we mus try hard an do betta an betta, long as we lib in dis wol." "Peshally" and "potlicka," (especially, and particular,) are favorite words throughout the island, and are used in every possible connexion.

"I is a new 'prentis, dis cum fer try, an aldo I get nottin dis time, I hope fer betta luck nex time ; an good heif to dem dat win, an dem no win, de same."

The religion of the slaves, so far as they had any, was a modified African heathenism, baptised into the names and forms of Christianity. Obicism and Mialism prevailed over the whole island ; these are ancient African superstitions, and are sometimes represented as antagonistic ; Obii being the spirit of evil, and Mial the spirit of good ; but it is often hard to distinguish between their deeds, and the hateful crimes and vices of their priests and believers. Obii men, and Mial men were "the great power of God." They wrought

all manner of miracles ; caused, cured and foretold sicknesses, plagues, afflictions, losses—possessed and dispossessed houses of evil spirits, &c.

Their great method of curing diseases was by suction. They professed to look through the body of the patient, and having detected the cause of the sickness, which an enemy had caused to be placed there by the Obiiman, they commenced sucking from the neck, side, arms, &c., skeins of thread, pins, needles, dog's and cat's teeth, fish bones, glass, red rags, &c. &c. All this was done for money, and the fee was proportioned to the ability of the patient to pay. These men were often profane, licentious, intemperate, and grossly ignorant, yet by their rude juggleries they had obtained an ascendancy over the minds of the people, as perfect as that of the idolatrous priests of Africa.

Another superstition, and an object of great terror, was "the rolling calf," which was represented as a bullkin with a clanking chain, prowling about at night, with eyeballs of fire, and breath of flame, destroying all he met. The original of this gross conception may be found in 1 Peter, v, 8.

The belief in ghosts was universal. The ghosts walked by day, as by night ; they ate and drank, bought and sold, and worked. They had a currency, a "ghost money" of their own, which would stay with none but themselves ; yet it was so much like the queen's good money, that many were deceived by it, and would have dealings with ghosts, without knowing it, till the ghost money would slip through their fingers and be off. They could not hold it fast ; it would melt away or burn through their hands ! Every child wore amulets to preserve it from being breathed upon by invisible ghosts, and from being carried off by visible ones. Every man and woman was guarded by the same charmed rag.

These superstitions are gradually yielding to the influence of truth and the light of freedom. Obicism and Mialism are now found only in the more ignorant and degraded neighborhoods. The "rolling calf," is becoming an exploded notion; charms and amulets are pretty generally dispensed with by the adults, though the children continue to wear them, merely, as their parents often aver, because it is "Jamaica fashion." They are extremely unwilling to avow the real object, till it is charged home to them; they will then excuse themselves thus: "Well minista, dem tell we from time mus do da pickny so. Me poor ignorance, me na know what me fer do. 'Posin da pickny him da sick an die, minista?"

The belief in ghosts is very much modified, but it is still quite general, even among many of the better informed and longer free. Three years ago, a house in the village of Morant Bay was said to be haunted; the noises and ghostly chatterings were heard by many very reputable persons. The facts were matter of public notoriety, and the best means of dispossessing or disposing of the haunted premises, was subject matter for several newspaper communications. The trick was never found out, and a great revival of superstitious belief and fear was the consequence.

Marriage, immersion and dreams, were the sum of all the religion of the slaves, and still constitute the staple of the native Baptist churches. The personal instruction, and enlightenment of "inquirers," was the duty of the "leaders," who had the great mass of chapel-going slaves under their control. The stereotyped reply to the question, "what must I do to be saved," was, "you mus follow massa Jesus," which meant that as the Savior had been tempted of the devil in the wilderness, so the inquirers must go into the wilderness, or in Jamaica par-

lance, "he must go to the bush." The inquirer spends some hours of the night "in the bush," among the rank growth of an old field, or in the woods, if near by, and at the next meeting of the class, gives an account of the sights he saw, and sounds he heard, which if the candidate has any imagination at all, his fears will magnify to an altogether orthodox bulk, and he is forthwith commended to baptism. This going "to the bush," is familiarly termed "seeing the devil," who is naturally a prominent personage in the conjurations of the poor, terrified, convicted sinner.

Since the decree of emancipation, the missionary bodies of England have vied with each other in their efforts for the moral elevation of the freedmen. In 1824, there were perhaps forty-five ministers of religion in Jamaica; some of these were state paid hirelings—seventeen were dissenting missionaries. In 1831, there were nearly one hundred ministers, forty-four of whom were dissenters. There are now not less than two hundred and ten ministers, of whom about one hundred are of the established churches of England and Scotland, thirty are Wesleyans, twenty-six Baptists, sixteen Presbyterians, thirteen Independents, fifteen Moravians, five "Wesleyan New-Connexion," four American Congregationalists. Besides these there are Jews three, Catholics five, Native Baptists twenty-five.

So large a band of missionaries, acting in concert, might carry the gospel to the inmost recesses of the island; and indeed, it has been heard in its most hidden fastnesses, but its echoes have died upon the ear of the demented negro, as its herald has passed from his view. The missionaries long since learned from experience, that the only efficient mode of labor was to establish themselves at given points, and, attracting the people around them, by the

patient repetition of "line upon line, precept upon precept," revive the paralyzed powers of their hearers, and impress upon them the words of eternal life. Allowing to each of these stations, an average of twelve hundred persons, young and old—a large average—there are two hundred and fifty thousand, receiving in some sort, religious instruction. And admitting that it is adapted to make them wise unto salvation—which certainly some of it is not—there are yet two hundred thousand persons on the island, who have no means of grace, no virtuous religious instruction whatever. Of these, about fifteen hundred are Catholics, five thousand are Jews, and twenty-five thousand are native Baptists.

The influences of the emancipation upon the religious condition of the freedmen, is by far its most interesting and important aspect. It excited in them strong feelings of gratitude, and with one voice they ascribed the praise to God, whom they were taught to regard as their new master, and to whom they transferred much of the servility they had shown to their old ones. The chapels were thronged, and multitudes earnestly sought admission to the bosom of the church. This exuberance of constitutional feeling, was regarded as the special bestowment of the Holy Spirit; a kind of compensation for the wrongs of the past. They were perfectly plastic under the hands of the ministry; they acquiesced in every thing, did every thing; but it was all external; there was no thought, no reflection among them, and scarcely the power of thought and reflection. As slaves they were ignorant of the value and uses of money, and now they as readily yielded their earnings for the erection of chapels, and the promotion of the gospel, as they did their persons to the externals of religion. This was regarded as high evidence of

religious devotion, and was proclaimed as such to Christendom. These persons were admitted to the church in incredible numbers. The adult baptisms by the missionaries of the London Baptist Missionary Society from 1835 to 1842, inclusive, were reported at twenty-five thousand, and by all other denominations there were probably forty thousand more, much the largest portion of whom were by the Wesleyans. Upwards of seven hundred members have been admitted by one minister in the course of a single year.

A great evil attending the religious effort in the island has been the neglect, on the part of many ministers, of simple, definite, elementary instruction. Their audiences have been large, their object the immediate conversion of the professedly impenitent; and forgetful of the degradation that slavery had wrought, they have inferred on the part of the people, a knowledge and a power of mental combination they do not possess. They have therefore been unintelligible to them, and their tone and manner, with frequent impassioned appeals, and the repetition of names with which they associate temporal freedom and eternal blessedness, have wrought upon excited feelings, and sometimes produced demonstrations as violent as they were irrational and evanescent. Some few ministers have purposely preached thus, with the view of gradually bringing the people up to themselves, rather than descend to their capacity; and to avoid losing an easy, fluent style, which on their return to England will render them acceptable preachers. Some of these have read their sermons, and in one instance, quoted Homer and Tacitus, to a congregation, the only intelligent person in which was our informant, and not one in ten of whom could read their own names. Yet a powerful revival and a large accession were the results of his la-

bors, but its subjects did not abandon their iniquities.

The standard of piety is very low, throughout the island, and especially in the larger churches. So hastily gathered, from such materials, it can not be expected that the life of godliness should be manifested by them, nor is it. The enthusiasm of grateful feeling has subsided. The influence of the missionary, as the protector and friend of the oppressed, is gone. The people have acquired many artificial wants, and these have taught them the value and uses of money. The restraints of religion have become irksome—general worldliness and selfish gratification, that were held in abeyance by the first gushings of free feeling, have resumed their sway. The progressive intelligence of the people enables them to perceive that paying a monthly "duty," and taking a ticket; marriage, joining the church, baptism, and the Lord's Supper, are not the seals of grace, nor passports to heaven. These, with the depressed state of the island, rendering it difficult to obtain continuous employment for fair wages, and the increasing use of intoxicating liquors, have produced a reaction, which may yet scatter in fragments many of the large churches.

There are exceptions to these remarks. Among much of "wood, hay, stubble," there are many truly ~~poor~~, devoted persons, who can give a reason for the faith that is in them. They will be found to be, both in number and intelligence, rather in the inverse ratio of the size of the churches to which they belong; for, where a charge of several thousand ignorant people is committed to a single missionary, it is impossible to give particular instruction to any of them.

We do not, in these statements, charge the missionaries with designed delinquency, or want of faithfulness. There was an earnest desire manifested by the English com-

munity to witness immediate results from their labors and sacrifices; and the glad news of extensive revivals, and of pentecostal admissions, was hailed by the whole nation with unbounded joy. Peculiar sanctity was inferred in the case of those missionaries, who rapidly gathered large churches, and the reverse—a want of zeal and holiness, feared for, and, in some instances, attributed to others, who, by a more careful and judicious process—by restraining the fervor of feeling, and requiring some intelligent views of the gospel, and a holy life, as well as strong professions of love to "Massa Jesus" prior to admission, built up smaller, but purer churches. This, no doubt, acted as a stimulus to gather large bodies. Add to this, the sympathy of the missionaries for the newly emancipated people; the readiness with which they yielded themselves to all the external observances of religion; the impossibility of knowing any thing of the daily walk of individuals among thousands; with the servility and hypocrisy of the people; their unconquerable repugnance to disclosing each other's faults; their great earnestness to gain admission to church fellowship, and the facility with which it is gained in some of the large denominations; and the wonder will rather be, that the churches are not larger and more numerous. The most lax disciplinarians have rejected many applicants.

The question is often asked, "What will be the influence of the present embarrassments, upon the future history of Jamaica? Can the island recover from them?"

We may hazard an opinion, that its future history will be its most fruitful, most peaceful, and most happy. The estates must pass from the absentees, who now hold them for a mere moiety of their estimated value under the colonial system, when they enjoyed the monopoly of

the English market, and come into the possession of thrifty resident proprietors, who will manage them without the intervention of attorneys, and overseers. The enormous governmental expenditure and weight of taxation will be greatly reduced by the action of the rising yeomanry, at the ballot-box or hustings. Competition will reduce the price of living, and the thrift and economy that have already been induced by the spirit of freedom, will rid the island of its greatest curse, the recklessness and extravagance of slavery.

These very desirable reforms are entirely feasible; and, once accomplished, Jamaica can not but be prosperous.

Within the past five years the temptations to intemperance have increased rapidly. Rum shops have multiplied in every direction; and, unless their influence can be destroyed, all the horrors of drunkenness lie directly in the pathway of the peasantry. Unhappily the missionaries, at the time of the emancipation, generally used intoxicating liquors themselves, and thus lost the fairest opportunity of turning the people from this snare. Since that time, many dissenters have become total abstainers, and there are flour-

ishing total abstinence societies at their several stations; but their influence is local, and the tremendous disturbing force of the established church, seems to blast every attempt to coalesce for any general reform. Efforts have been made, but they have failed; and they will continue to fail, till the missionaries shall abandon wine and malt, and fancied dignity, and heartily unite their influences against this vice. The successful result of such a union is not doubtful.

There are other vices to which the peasantry are peculiarly exposed; but they sink into insignificance, when compared with intemperance, and some of them live only by the rum bottle. There are cheering indications of a revival of total abstinence principles and zeal, and there is ground of hope, that ere long the various bodies of dissenters, with their churches, will organize a general total abstinence movement, and earnestly labor to rid the island of this moral pestilence. Should they originate such a movement, and conduct it to a happy issue, the time is not distant when the arguments for freedom will find illustration in an intelligent, industrious, and happy community of emancipated slaves.

#### NATIONAL UNITY.

The hardest problem man has to deal with, is out of many to make one. But it is a problem nature is ever gloriously resolving; for organization, which separates by an intelligible boundary the worlds of life and death, is her great mystery and work. The formation of a mass by the aggregation of particles, (as many rocks have been composed, each of which is a confused, cemented heap,) is quite a different thing from the production of a plant. In the one case, there is mere acci-

dental *juxta-position*, an accumulation of chance-gathered materials, without any principle of arrangement; in the other, growth from a seed, which has life within itself, involving potentially all that is afterwards unfolded. When this seed is quickened, and germination takes place, there is a process of assimilation begun, in which the plant gathers its nourishment from the earth, and air, and light, and incorporates the foreign substance with itself as a living, homogeneous part

of its own system. With the progress of growth, many organs with distinct functions appear, each admirably adapted to its specific purpose, and all co-working harmoniously towards the accomplishment of the end for which all exist. The root that abstracts nutriment from the earth by its delicate fibres, the sap vessels of the stem that convey this to every part, and the leaves, with their broad surfaces, for carrying on respiration, different as they are in structure, are all necessary to the final result, the ripening of the seed.

We may see a beautiful illustration of this law of organization, as well as of the lower principle of outward and mechanical arrangement, (of which crystallization is an example,) in the divine record of the creation. The elements of all bodies were first brought forth, as naked elements, "without form and void,"

"Outrageous as a sea, dark, wasteful, wild."

But, step by step, laws were impressed on the chaotic mass, and this goodly universe rose out of the watery abyss, with its blue o'erarching firmament, its seas, its solid land, and their unsummed wealth of vegetable and animal life. This world of ours is just *an organized chaos*. And that which we see in the lower spheres of creation, is typical of the higher; for all nature prophesies of Him who is its lord, and sets forth the more glorious mystery of His being in its manifold symbols. Physiologists tell us that the human body is the epitome of all organized bodies, while it far surpasses them all in the number of its parts, their close relation to a common center, and the powers of its various organs. A handful of shapeless dust, as worthless as that we tread on, became, through the organizing power of the principle of life inbreathed by the Creator, the solid, bony frame, the network of nerves, the circula-

ting blood, the beating heart, the thinking brain, and all else that belongs to this temple of an immortal spirit, within which a thousand processes are continually going on, which is formed for dominion over the world without, and bears stamped upon its countenance the intellectual image of its Maker.

It is thus that nature is ever solving the problem of national unity. But we see, also, amongst the inferior animals, a law of fellowship, by which they are grouped together in tribes, organized into commonwealths, made obedient to leaders—in other words, a social unity—and we look to find something analogous to this in the structure of humanity. We can imagine men in a state of isolation, each the sole occupant of a planet; but this would not be the highest form of human life. Man, existing in separateness and solitude, could not attain that position of dignity and blessedness, which he holds when he is associated with others under laws that bring him into new relations. The planets, which make up our solar system, might have been created entirely independent of each other, each with its own motion upon its axis; but they subserve nobler uses, now that they revolve in harmony around a common center. Their arrangement under a new law gives them new forces, and takes nothing away. The sun, encircled by tributaries, to which he imparts light, and warmth, and motion, holds a higher place than if banished to a point from which no ray, or influence of attraction, could ever reach any part of the creation. So, to be a father, a giver of life, a defender and guide to other beings, is a higher and more blessed thing, than to be an isolated creature, sustaining no relations to others. Nor need union with others under a law, destroy individuality by absorbing the personal element into a mass. The stones which are set in the arch lose nothing of their

distinctive qualities, but acquire powers by the combination which they had not before. They remain the same in size, and shape, and properties; but when so placed as to realize the idea in the mind of the architect, they become a new creation. They were a heap of stones lying confusedly together; they are now a majestic, self-sustaining arch, throwing its span across some mighty river, and strong to sustain the pressure of thronging multitudes, while tall ships sail securely beneath.

This may illustrate the possibility of uniting mankind under laws, which, without destroying the personality of the individual, shall elevate him into a higher region of existence. Man is not like a chemical element, which, in combination, may disappear altogether; nor like an irresponsible animal, which is subjected to laws wholly from without, and for the sole benefit of another; but he is a person, made in the image of God, a partaker of reason, possessed of a responsible will, and thus exists, in some sort, from himself, and for himself. The problem is how to organize these personal elements, while we recognize and secure their distinctness; or how to place *men* under a common system, without crushing *man*, and making him the particle of a mass.

The law of the nation can not be understood without reference to the structure of the household, which existed before it in the order of nature. In the union of the first pair by the act of God, the household was established; and every one that has since been born, has been born a member of it. Each one is brought into existence, not as an individual simply, a solitary, independent element, but as a child bound in the closest relationship to two parents, and placed under their rule. Their organization is begun, through a divine law, predetermining the place and the functions of each. In the

household there is no mere juxtaposition of equals, but a grouping of all around a central organ, from which they receive law and blessing. This was the beginning of the building up of society, and from this it is easy to trace the steps by which all politics have been formed. In the infancy of the world, when the law of primogeniture prevailed, the household naturally and speedily enlarged itself into the tribe, (the patriarch ruling over his remote descendants,) and its growth was like that of the banyan tree, whose branches root themselves in the earth, and become, in turn, the parents of encircling groups, till a huge forest springs up around, all intertwined, and bound together by the law of an ever-circulating life.

Hence we see the falsehood of that doctrine of the social compact, which teaches that men originally entered into society because of the inconveniences of living in solitude, and that it was a mere matter of voluntary agreement. Men never stood isolated and independent, as this theory represents them: they were born into the household, and the household grew into the nation. It was never left to their choice, whether to associate themselves or not; they were associated by a law coeval with their existence, and from which they could never be freed but by an act of rebellion.

But though the household is the germ of the nation, there is a generic difference between them. The state is something more than an enlargement of the family. The one is for the training and government of children, the other for the government of men. The one is an ordinance for the defense and nurture of that period of man's life, in which his personal existence and self-sustaining energy is slowly evolving itself; but, while admirably adapted to this end, it can not furnish a sphere wide enough for the developed powers of manhood. It is the nursery of man;

but men do not always need to remain in the nursery. The young seedlings require for a time the sheltered enclosure and the gardener's watchful care ; but if you leave them in their crowded ranks too long, you have a stinted growth. Transplant them, and give them room enough, and each becomes a wide-shadowing tree, whose roots clasp the earth in a strong embrace, and whose branches wrestle victoriously with the storm. So the discipline appointed for infancy, and most needful for it, would dwarf manhood. In those eastern monarchies, (as China,) where the state is nothing more than the household expanded, and the paternal character overshadows the regal in the chief magistrate, the government is an intrusive despotism, and the people remain children, overshadowed by an all-monopolizing power, which leaves them no room for growth, and keeps them in perpetual infancy.

A nation may be defined with sufficient accuracy for our present purpose, a number of families, so great as to exceed the limits of a tribe, formed into a body politic, which has within itself the exclusive right of jurisdiction over the territory which it permanently occupies. The physical structure of the globe necessitates the existence of mankind in distinct and separate nations. Its seas, and gulfs, and lakes, its trackless deserts and lofty mountains, are natural barriers and boundaries, which may, indeed, be partially overcome by the stern ambition of dominion, as when Rome marched steadily on to the conquest of the world, or the Asiatic chieftains swept over numberless lands ; but yet do hinder the formation of a universal monarchy. And if we compare the tribes of Greece with the overgrown monarchies of Asia, we shall see that many centers of national life are most favorable to personal freedom and intellectual

development. Within a narrow circumference, the relation of each part to the center is most close and strong. That it was the divine purpose to separate mankind into distinct nations, was early shown by a direct and supernatural interposition. When "the whole earth was of one language and of one speech," and men began to build a city and a tower to be the capital of a universal empire, he confounded their language, and so compelled them to go forth in separate families and tribes in search of new habitations. We believe that in that preternatural breaking up of society, the law of the household was honored ; and that the nations, which grew out of that convulsion, were not mixed multitudes, chance-gathered, like the motley wrecks which the tempest strews upon the shore, but races of a common origin, bound together by the ties of kindred. It would be impossible to trace their history from that time, for emigration, wars, and the results of commerce, have changed all national boundaries a thousand times, and broken up and mingled together the great nations of antiquity, till their identity is almost lost. Nor does it fall within our purpose to show the origin of the nations of Christendom out of the ruins of the Roman Empire, mingled with the rude institutions of its northern conquerors, and to point out how, through the power of Christian faith, the rich and various products of European life were evolved out of the darkness and chaos of those convulsive times. Our design is simply to speak of National Unity as involved in the idea of a nation, and to show by what means alone a vital and permanent union can be given to many parts, and a territory be transformed into a country.

There is a blind spirit of cosmopolitanism, disguised under the fair name of universal philanthropy, which wars against national distinc-

tions, and makes light of patriotism, as if it were a narrow and sectarian principle. It would break down all barriers, blend all differences, and amalgamate all races together, till all were reduced to the dead level of a most barren sameeness. Nothing short of the whole world is large enough for the embrace of this most expansive spirit, and playing the chemist, it would put all nations into its crucible, and melt them into undistinguishable uniformity. But we hold that the existence of the nation, as an independent, self-regulating polity, is indispensable in the education of the race; and that love for one's country, stronger than we bear to any other land, is a religious duty. We ought to exult in its greatness, to sorrow over its misfortunes, and be ready to pour out our blood in its defense. The state is something more than the people, (as the arch is something more than the stones,) and when they are organized into it, and penetrated by a national life, they are lifted at once into a higher, more beautiful, and more glorious existence. New feelings are awakened, new attachments called forth, new energies developed, new features of character made to start into the light. The state, rightly builded, is the most majestic representation possible on earth, of the supreme government; the best embodiment and realization of divine justice. It gives the most impressive and effectual testimony against transgression, in the stern sentences of judgment, and the pains and penalties of law; thus re-echoing the voice of the everlasting King, and giving a pledge and foreshowing of the retributions of the world to come. It testifies, not in words only, as doth the church, but in stern and solemn acts, that man was born to be the subject of law; and thus it prepares him, by the discipline of this lower, earthly sphere, to yield to a higher, spiritual order, and to move in the harmonies of heaven.

The state, we repeat it, is essential to the perfecting of man, and exalts and blesses every one who is a member of it. We have no sympathy with those that think lightly of national attachments, and we believe that the heart, which despises and repels them, has a poor soil for any noble affections to grow in. That is a sickly sentimentality, which would sigh even over the carnage of a battle-field, on which the liberties of a country had been won, and which can see nothing glorious in the armed might of navies, when they form a bulwark of strength around one's native shores. Great an evil as war unquestionably is, it is a far less one than the dull pulsations of the national heart, foreboding the dying out of the national life, for with that all greatness and goodness die, and nothing is left but the spawn of corruption that fatten on the carcass.

But all life, in organized bodies, implies unity; and when this is destroyed, dissolution goes on, and decomposition into the original elements is the issue. There can be no nation without unity, for it must act as one through its appropriate organs; and when it ceases to do this, it falls abroad into disconnected parts. National unity, in its highest power, is such a combination of the members of a state, that all shall act for each, and each for all, and their concentrated powers flow through common channels for the common blessing.

The first means to this is, *that there be a central power to which all the parts shall be subordinated.* Unity supposes a center, by their common relation to which many become one. There must be in the state a central organ for the administration of the fundamental law, from which a controlling influence shall go forth to the remotest extremities. Nor is this constituted by the parts, but in the order of nature, exists before them, as the

branches do not give law to the tree, but the tree to the branches. The members of the household do not appoint its constitution; they are born under it, or come under it by the law of marriage, and find themselves subject to it, not it to them. The sum of the parts of any body is quite a different thing from their unity. The human frame can be torn asunder, limb by limb, and the quivering parts, laid side by side, would form the sum of its members; but their unity would stand in their living union in the body of living man. The one is a mere mechanical addition; the other is possible only through a vital force which subordinates the parts to its own law of working. The materials of which a nation is composed may exist long before they were joined together by the power of a national life, as the stones exist before the arch, and the chemical elements before the plant. But when these materials become so united as to form a state, they become subjected to a higher law than is in themselves. The powers with which the state is clothed do not originate in its separate members, any more than the law of the arch originates in the stones that form it. In plainer words, the unity of a nation requires a central government, which, through its various organs, legislative, judicial, and executive, shall give law to the whole country, and exercise ultimate jurisdiction over all its parts. Without this there can be a confederacy, but no nation. If the powers of the separate portions do transcend the powers of the whole, there is no true unity. Far back in the old Saxon time, the soil of England was occupied by many independent kingdoms struggling together for dominion, and the land was filled with confusion and strife. But the law of national life began to work among the chaotic elements, and, one by one, those petty states became subjected to its power. England arose, no mere confeder-

acy of the kingdoms of the Saxon heptarchy, no creature of an alliance between rival sovereignties, but a nation, in the unity of which they all had their place as subordinate parts, and received their life-blood from one great central heart.

Our history has been different. There has never been a true fusion of the states into one nation. There has been an alliance, but no fusion. The general government is claimed to be the mere creature of the members of the confederacy, and, of course, to possess fewer of the attributes of sovereignty than they. Its powers are a *grant*, a concession from parties to a compact, who watch the execution of them more in the spirit of superiors than subordinates. The allegiance of the people is challenged by the states as their own right. And the frequent threats of dissolving the union, and the continual allusions to such an event as an alternative to be preferred to some other (whether the imposition of a protective tariff, or the continuance of domestic slavery), show how feebly we are bound together by the law of an organic life. Dissolve the Union! If we were one nation in the innermost power of national unity, this would be more than the snapping of certain external bands, leaving the states unaffected in their internal relations: it would be the death-struggle of the land, the breaking up of all foundations, the dissolution of all law.

It is a striking illustration of this that we have no national name, no name expressing such a union of the parts as to form one whole. If we bind together eight and twenty rods by an external band, we call them a bundle of rods, for they have no unity. But if a tree from one trunk sends forth as many branches, it does not cease to be one tree, for they are all one in the unity of a common life. So our eight and twenty states are truly *United States*, a bundle of states tied together by

the dead cords of a written constitution. America is not a name peculiar to us; it belongs to the continent.

The central power must, also, be a center for all the parts; otherwise the unity of the nation is impaired. The government must be the organ of the states, not of a party. It must be the representative of the nation, and act for the blessing of the nation. If it be the mere instrument of a faction; if it labor for the aggrandizement of the party which lifted it into power, and postpone national ends to this; then is there a virtual schism in the body politic, and unity is at an end. It is a question deserving of most serious thought, whether the existence of organized parties in a state, separated by fundamental differences, and pledged (by the force of public sentiment at least) to administer the government on party principles, is not subversive of the highest ends of a national polity. If an administration, which is the *state in act*, is to be, as a matter of course, systematically resisted and maligned by one half the people, and as systematically lauded and supported by the other half, it can never subserve the *moral* ends for which government was established. Nor will it grasp the national interests in one grand and harmonious scheme, because the force of partisan influences will be ever deflecting it from its true course. But there may be, and perchance here lies our safety, a deep under-current of national instincts and aims, bearing along in its mighty flow those party strifes which are mere eddies upon its surface.

A second condition of national unity is, that the nation grows out of itself, or that its chief enlargement be by natural increase. This is the generic difference between a living body and a lifeless mass, that the one grows from a germ which contains the law of the plant or animal, and increases through the vital process of assimilation; while the

other is a mere congeries, an accidental collection of particles like a sand-hill in the desert, which the fierce winds gather and dissipate at their pleasure. The healthy plant takes into itself no more foreign substances than it can thoroughly transmute into its own essence, and make component parts of itself; and so it must be with a nation. We have seen that in the first ages of the world, and according to the divine constitution, the household was the germ of every large society, and grew into it. The life of the seed was continuously evolved, and the nation was formed by a harmonious growth from within, not by an accidental and heterogeneous increase from without. Hence the Present was never severed from the Past, and the inestimable blessings of a common ancestry and a common language were secured. We lay it down as a fundamental principle, that when national life has begun to unfold itself, and a nation has truly begun to exist, its chief enlargement should be by birth and not by immigration. Otherwise, it will be with it as with the overlaid infant, which perishes under the burden it has no strength to bear; or as with a structure that falls to pieces from too great accumulation of chance materials—and the seeds of a new existence must be planted amongst the ruins. For a nation, which is truly such, has a specific constitution or organic law, not written perhaps, but embodied in institutions, and ever acting as the shaping spirit of its character and course. Now as the law of growth in any living body forbids the receiving of nutriment which can not be assimilated, but must remain an alien thing; so all who become members of the state, ought to be possessed by the spirit of the state, or they can never act in harmony with it. This is best secured by their being born within its bosom, and trained from infancy under its institutions. It is not the

studying of any political text-book, that qualifies a man to become a citizen; it is the formation of his character by the thousand influences that surround him in society, and from which he can no more escape than from the all encompassing atmosphere. He thus imperceptibly imbibes the spirit of his country, and is cast in her mold. The native children of any land must understand best the law of her institutions, and be most thoroughly penetrated by her life; and on them mainly must she rely to guide her counsels, and lead her on in the career of glory.

Besides, there is something sacred in a birthright, as being hallowed by the ties of nature. That which is transmitted to us from honored ancestors, is doubly precious in our eyes, because it is associated with their achievements and sufferings. A son sets a higher value on the old homestead than a stranger would, and will endure greater sacrifices to hand it down to his children. The relationship of blood is stronger than the relationship of adoption. And it can not but be that the sons of noble sires would cherish ancestral recollections with deeper reverence, and cling with a fonder love to the glorious heritage bequeathed them, than those who are engrafted from an alien stock.

The history of Europe is an exemplification of this great principle. It is true that during the long death-struggles of the Roman empire, when the floods of barbarians were rushing in from the frozen north, there was a great mingling of races in every land, and homogeneousness of national character was impossible. That was the time when the seeds of nations were planted, and it is often difficult to determine when these began to germinate, and to fix the true beginnings of national existence. No doubt there has been much of invasion and conquest in subsequent ages, as by the Danes

and Normans in England; and foreign elements have been violently mingled with those of native growth, sometimes to the advantage of the latter, when the national spirit had become enervated. But on the whole, the law of growth from itself has prevailed in every European country, and hence the strong hereditary attachments, the fixed social usages, the distinctive features of national character, the love of kindred and race, all of which have given a permanency to their institutions, which seems almost to defy the assaults of time.

We may be pointed to Rome as a contradiction of the principle, for she grew chiefly by conquest, and joined all languages and races to herself, by her all-subduing arm. But in truth there is no contradiction here. Rome was never a nation—she was a city born for dominion, raised up to be the mistress of the world. She was never the mere capital of a country, the central heart of a nation—she was herself the all-in-all. Italy never sustained a like relation to Rome, as England to London. The possessions of the imperial city never constituted a country; they were only tributary provinces, kept in subjection by her iron rod, and made to pour their treasures into her lap, but never the partakers of her life, and the sharers of her power.

The constitution and laws of the Hebrew commonwealth were a model in this, as in many other points. The nation was descended from one patriarch, and was bound together by community of origin, and glorious hereditary recollections. Its growth was chiefly from itself, and, hence, in every stage of its existence, it was linked to that Past in which the seeds of its life were first planted, and from which the voices of its prophets were ever speaking. But strangers were not excluded from their country, nor treated with harshness while sojourning in it.

They were commanded to have one law for themselves and for the stranger within their gates, and were charged to remember that they were once strangers in the land of Egypt. Foreigners could also become incorporated into the state, and enjoy all the privileges of citizenship, if they desired it, and proved themselves worthy; but such a step implied so much, it was such a breaking-away from all existing bonds of country and kindred and religion, and such an assumption of new responsibilities, that the number of adopted citizens always bore a small proportion to the lineal descendants of Abraham. Some tribes, possessed of an inveterate hostility to the house of Israel, were excluded from these privileges in the third generation; and in one instance, the exclusion was to be perpetual. The great principle on which these features of their polity were based, we believe to be a sound one, and essential to true national unity, viz., that a nation should increase chiefly by the evolving of its own life, and that all additions to it from foreign sources should be made so slowly, and with such previous preparation, as to transfer no disturbing elements into the body politic.

Our condition, in this respect, is unlike that of any other nation. Our vast unoccupied territory, and the freedom of our institutions act as continual temptations to the over-crowded multitudes in the Old World, where society is groaning under the accumulated corruptions of ages; and hundreds of thousands—a motley mixture of races, languages, and religions—are annually finding a home on our shores. This is certainly an infelicity of our situation, for it hinders our proper national growth, by the introduction of new and strange elements, faster, we fear, than they can be taken up and incorporated. And that part of our country suffers most from this evil, which will soon have the political

preponderance, and by which our national destiny is to be decided. To our mind, the darkest feature in the condition of the West is the want of an organic principle, and the absence of an organizing process. There are materials gathered there and gathering, of all degrees of excellence; but there is yet no vital union of the parts. There is increase, but no growth. The carcass swells, but there is no body. There is a vast assemblage of men, but no commonwealth. The fusing power is wanting to blend many into one.

We feel the evil less in the Atlantic states, because the tide of emigration passes by us, and has little effect to weaken the strong ties formed by our common origin, and the cementing influence of the common perils of the Revolution. We have our past in which our roots strike deep, and hence there is here far more of the true principle of growth, than can exist amidst the surging waves of the West. We are not complaining that multitudes of the poor and the oppressed flee to our land as an asylum, nor would we set up any barrier to exclude them, for the finger of an inevitable Providence is clearly in it; and yet it acts most unfavorably on the development of our national life. In tearing themselves away from their ancient homes, all ancient ties are weakened; and the vital question is, What new ones are formed in place of them? If the central forces of our system were of fiery intensity, these fast-gathering materials would soon be incorporated as homogeneous parts. But here is the secret of our weakness, and the source of our danger. The tendency of all things with us is not to combine, but to separate, to individualize, to isolate. Is not that the one law of our progress hitherto, the fundamental idea which seems to shape our course, and to determine our national acts? The most influential causes which led to the settlement

of the country, may be summed up in this one—to *escape oppression*. It was so with the Puritans, with the Huguenots, and with the Roman Catholics of Maryland; and we believe it may safely be said of all, that the desire of a larger liberty and of a fairer field, influenced them to try their fortunes in the wilderness. To escape control in the church and the state, to vindicate the rights of conscience, and so to secure personal liberty, was the deep-rooted principle working secretly beneath, though it manifested itself under the most diverse forms. There were, at the first, many other elements mingled with this, of a more conservative and even aristocratical character, which retarded its developments, and tempered its workings; but we much mistake if, from the beginning, this was not the *differentia* of our character and institutions, full of hidden life and power. Hence in due time came the breaking of our colonial bonds in the war of the Revolution; and hence that movement continually gaining ground, though resisted in the beginning by the sages and patriots of our land, seeks to destroy all exclusive privileges, and, of course, all corporations and organized bodies, and to individualize and equalize to the very uttermost. Our boast is that we have freedom, as no other nation has it. Liberty and equality are our watchwords. The peculiarity of our institutions is, that they proclaim and defend the integrity of man as a person, and do not suffer him to be absorbed into the mass and crushed there, as in the old world. But for that very reason they are deficient in constructive power. The individualizing principle is purely negative, seeking to remove restrictions, to break down superiority, and to place all men upon the same level of privileges. It is good, therefore, to destroy old and worn-out organizations, but it can not organize anew. It re-

duces all things to their simplest elements, but can not recompose them. It concerns itself not with *men*, but with *man*, with humanity in the abstract, *in puris naturalibus*—stark naked. It recognizes that in all men which is alike, not that which differs; and deals not with the father, the child, the husband, the wife, but with the human being. If this be the overmastering tendency, the *lex non scripta*, of our land, our progress is not towards unity. We need to do more than teach every man his standing as a man, and secure for him his freedom and personal rights; otherwise, the multitudes hastening hither from other lands, that mistake lawlessness for liberty, will not learn from us a lesson of submission to order. It is not enough to knock off the old cement, and lay every stone by itself; they must be arranged and compacted anew in the stately structure of society. It is not enough to loosen all false and galling bonds, if we strengthen not those eternally ordained of God. The truth seems, therefore, to be divided between those parties now contending about the respective rights of natives and foreigners. Those who desire to see foreign elements less active and influential in the state, best understand the ideal of a nation; while those who would obliterate all national differences, discern most clearly the spirit of the age, and act most in harmony with the law of our progress hitherto. It is, indeed, a monstrous doctrine, that there is nothing peculiarly sacred in a birth-right, and that all the rights and privileges of citizenship should be thrown open, like an unfenced common, which every hoof treads down; but it is quite too late to resist it. The *ideal* is not practicable, and the practicable is far enough from being the true ideal; but all that is left us is to mould, as best we can, the alien materials that can never be excluded.

A third means of securing national unity, is *by a well defined and permanent territory*. By this we mean, that the nation should have fixed habitations, and within moderate limits, inasmuch as an overgrown territory and frequent changes of abode, are both unfavorable to the cementing of strong attachments amongst the people. The soil upon which a nation is planted, and in the absolute ownership of which its independence stands, becomes almost identified with it. There the life of the nation has unfolded itself, and made it the theater of the national labors, enterprises, and glories. Places become memorials of high exploits, links of union with the past, and incentives to noble deeds in all coming time. The peasant who crosses the field where Wallace conquered, the scholar who makes his pilgrimage to the house where Shakspeare was born, and the Christian who treads reverently in a ruined abbey where a holy choir ages ago chaunted the praises of God,—each feels an influence reaching from the dead, and consecrating the soil on which he stands. Every spot becomes associated with memorable events, and acquires an intellectual and moral significance. The dead earth is quickened with life, and vocal with melodies floating from mountain and lake and river, which speak to the hearts of men. How must they feel knit to each other, who look with a common joy or sorrow over their native land, bearing engraven upon its face the story of their nation's greatness or of its wrongs.

Let us imagine the English nation to be removed in a body, queen, nobles and people, to some one of their possessions in the southern sea; would not the result show not merely that English character, in its finer features, is indissolubly connected with English soil, but also that the bands which have bound them in so marvellous a unity, had

been loosened, if not broken, by the shock? They could scarcely be separated from their island-home with its rocky cliffs and resounding shores, from the Thames and the Severn, from the land which Alfred and Elizabeth governed, and which martyrs watered with their blood, without the entire breaking up of their social structure. No doubt the old Saxon energy would bring forth some noble fruit again, but England would never reappear. That form of national life which has been gradually developing itself for ages within the narrow mould of the British isle, would never bear transplanting.

We believe that smallness of territory has much to do with the strength of national attachments. Concentration gives intensity. The life of the nation rolls back upon itself, and becomes fixed and deepened. As with the circles in the pool, which ever widening, do at last so spread themselves abroad, as to be blended with the watery mass and disappear, so is it with the enlargement of territory as bearing on national character. All sense of mutual connection, all unity of feeling and aim, is gradually lost; and you have a collection of neighborhoods, instead of a country. The evil is of course aggravated, if this enlargement of national boundaries brings in foreign races. It would be an evil, even if the population remained homogeneous; it is incalculably increased, when alien elements are thus introduced into the body politic.

The course of things amongst ourselves in this respect, is of portentous aspect. The annexation of Texas, as affecting our nationality, was bad enough; but the annexation of Mexico would well nigh destroy it. There would be more policy in holding that country as a conquered province, than in admitting it to an equality of political privileges. Such heterogeneous elements

can never combine. It is madness to think of comprehending in one country all that lies between the two oceans, and of bringing the whole of North America within the federal union. Far better than this, had the western base of the Alleghanies been washed by the waves of the Pacific. The spirit that desires such an enlargement of our territory, is not patriotism, but the lust of power, such as stirred up the French Jacobins to their frenzied crusade against all the ancient governments of Europe, that they might establish one vast republic on the ruins.

The prospect is that as a nation, we shall soon have forsaken our ancient seats. The only part of our territory which has any strong historical interest, is the Atlantic states, the old thirteen. There the seeds of our national life were first planted, there were our birth-struggles, there the new-born nation first saw the light. But we are fast removing from them, and in a few years they will have been deserted by a numerical majority of the people. That which is now going on, is virtually a national emigration, for it is more than an enlargement of the extremities, the centre remaining the same; power is going also; and soon the nation will be found removed from the battle-ground of their fathers, from the soil rich in glorious recollections, from the only links of union with the past, far away upon the prairies of the west, or the plains of Texas, with as little to remind them of the land from whence they sprung, as there is on the level ocean.

A fourth means of national unity lies in oneness of religious faith and worship. The spiritual life of a people is their truest, innermost life; and unity here is the true source of unity in all the outward spheres of their existence. From this central fountain flow forth the strongest influences to control and mould the whole being of man. For

good or for evil, faith in unseen things and supernatural powers, has been the most active and the most mighty of all the agencies that have ever been working at the heart of society. The vast overshadowing systems of Pagan idolatry, which were indissolubly linked in with all the institutions of the state, and the history of Mahomedanism, which burst like a whirlwind upon the eastern world, but like the whirlwind did not pass away, show how political institutions have been shaped by religious principles. And so it must be. The earthly and fleeting elements of man's life are connected with an encompassing eternity, and must be influenced by that which is higher and more enduring. No one can deny the power of faith (the sphere of which is super-terrestrial) in matters of which governments take cognizance. It made the Jew intractable and rebellious under the dominion of Rome; it set the early Christians, meek and gentle though they were, in stern resistance to the idolatrous laws of the empire; and, in every age, it has introduced a new and difficult element into political affairs. Where men differ fundamentally on that highest of all questions, they can not be one in the deepest unity of a national life. How much have differences in faith disturbed and vexed the world! What strifes and commotions have they kindled! And even where hostile parties have proceeded to no such extremities of violence, yet there can not be that inward union, that flowing together of affections, that acknowledged community of interests, which are essential to the highest perfection of a nation.

As the spiritual in man, when awakened, is the controlling part of his being, so Christianity has always exerted a mighty influence on the external life of nations. Unity in the church would both act as a harmonizing principle, and serve as a

model for the institutions of the state. A spiritual and ecclesiastical union would prepare the way for a political union. It was most happy for Europe, that, at the time its institutions were slowly forming, after the dissolution of the Roman Empire, the church was not broken up into conflicting sects, but had, to a great extent, united, both in government and in doctrine. When society was in a chaotic state, the ecclesiastical element was all that was stable, and it formed a barrier against the breakings of anarchy, and kept the principle and the example of order before the eyes of that lawless time. Men learned to go up to one altar in their holy worship, and to be subject to one system of spiritual discipline, before they were brought together into the unity of the state. And as the church was the nucleus around which European society crystallized, so, when it is broken up into factions, and the spiritual life of the people is decomposed and dissipated, we see a sure forerunner of political ruptures and dissolution. The real weakness of England, (under the appearance of amazing strength,) and her chief difficulties of administration, grew out of her fierce religious quarrels. Ireland and the education question supply proofs enough of this.

In this means of national unity we are deficient. Our land is a sort of battle-ground, where all faiths are meeting in mortal conflict. The church neither exemplifies the law, nor conveys the influences of unity; but her divisions introduce an element of discord into the state, and hinder the close cementing of the people in the bonds of a common life. The great religious denominations of our country are cracking and crumbling more and more, and these inner spiritual dissensions necessarily propagate themselves in the outer circles of social and political feelings and interests. The schism in one of the largest ecclesi-

astical bodies, growing out of the agitation of a great moral and political question—that touching domestic slavery—forebodes a more complete alienation of affection, a more radical loosening of common ties, between different sections of our union, than has yet been; and it needs no sagacity to foretell that, if the bonds of a common Christianity are broken, none other will long be strong enough to hold us together.\*

In fine, this is our ideal of a nation. That it should have a central power, as the symbol and organ of the national life, to which all the parts should be subordinated, and around which the national affections should cluster; that it should increase mainly from itself by the natural law of growth, and thus secure the inestimable benefits of a common ancestry, and a common language; that it should occupy the same country, from age to age, with ever-strengthening local attachments; and that, through oneness in faith and worship, it should have one spiritual life, as the true source and sustaining strength of all outward unity. Great as our shortcomings may be, when tried by this ideal, we have most hopeful feelings as to our ultimate destiny. The position assigned us, in the grand scheme of Providence, seems to forbid, for the present, the perfection of a national constitution. Our work has been to subdue the wilderness, and to people it with teeming life. Year by year the abodes of civilization are moving swiftly towards the Pacific; and the pioneers are already scaling the summits of the Rocky Mountains, or winding their way through its defiles towards the vallies of the Columbia. We are strewing the continent with materials to be worked up hereafter. But the lower forms of national existence

\* As the writer is neither a Roman Catholic, nor an Episcopalian, he can not be suspected of any party aims in the expression of the foregoing views.

will not always satisfy us. Already do we see a longing for a higher unity in those schemes of association which are becoming so rife—schemes unsound in principle, and utterly impracticable—but growing out of a feeling of desolation, a sense of isolation. So loose are the ties which now bind men together. We have been seeking to build a solar system with the centrifugal force alone. We need, and the need is beginning to be felt, another power that shall draw men towards a common center, and make them to move in harmonious orbs around it. The peculiarity of our institutions has lain too much in leaving men to themselves, in giving them the lar-

gest liberty, in letting the glowing metal run at its own wild will, and form itself into ragged and unsightly shapes. But a change will come—not, perhaps, till the evil has reached its consummation, the storm passed over the face of the land, and the shock of the earthquake opened the abyss beneath our feet. For the present seems to be the time throughout all lands, of the breaking up of the old foundations, and of the overflowing of the old landmarks. But the storm shall cease, and the floods abate, and the hills and the green earth appear; and then shall the glorious destiny be accomplished for which we are reserved in the plans of an all-comprehending Providence.

---

#### MODERN FRENCH LITERATURE.\*

THIS is a useful and seasonable volume. It originated in a suggestion of William and Robert Chambers, of Edinburgh, who have of late done so much for a really popular literature in Great Britain. These publishers were persuaded, that "this full account of the respectable literature of France, drawn up from an extensive and minute knowledge of the subject, might help to promote a good understanding between France and England."

M. de Véricour, who is a member of the Archæological Society of Rome, and the Historical Institute of France, was formerly a professor at the Royal Athénæum in Paris. He has resided several years in England, and written an *Essay on Milton and Epic Poetry*, which was

well received by the leading British reviews. In his preface, the author expresses the conviction, "that the English public is liable to be misled, with regard to French literature, by the injustice of a partial, capricious fame, and by the venality of the public press." He adds, that it is his belief, that the estimate of French literature current among the better classes in England, is unjust to the best writers of France, and that these classes are in a great degree ignorant of the higher and better tone which French literature has assumed, in connection with the very great change for the better which the French people have experienced during the present century. To correct this mistaken and unjust judgment, by introducing to the acquaintance of his readers the better writers who have appeared in France since her first revolution, and by apprising them of the improved state of thought and feeling of which their works are at once the cause and the effect, is the design of this volume. It is difficult to predict whether

---

\* *Modern French Literature.* By L. Raymond de Véricour, formerly Lecturer in the Royal Athénæum, Paris, &c. &c. Revised, with notes alluding particularly to writers prominent in late political events in Paris; by William Stoughton Chase, A.M. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, 1848. 12mo, pp. 448.

the author will or will not be successful in his efforts to abate the hereditary prejudices of the English against the French. We are certain that he has produced a book which contains much information that can be gleaned from no other single volume, and the tone of which is healthful and elevated.

The work is divided into ten chapters, to which the American editor has appended some seventy pages of notes, and a list of contemporaneous French writers. The first chapter is introductory, in which the author gives at length his views of what literature is, and of the principles by which he proposes to conduct his critical review—with extended illustrations on both these points, presented in a pretty full sketch of French literature as it has been and as it now is. His views of what literature is, and of the influence which it exerts, may be seen in the following passage.

"Literature is indeed a most varied and unbounded universe; it is not only, according to the usual French definition, the expression of society, but also its very life and soul. With its numerous names, forms, and species, literature is not only a mirror reflecting society or national progress, but is also the breath that animates and vivifies a nation, arousing it to life and greatness, or impelling it to crime and anarchy. Literature may either be a powerful instrument for creation and regeneration, or a fatal one for destruction. Ages and nations may owe their formation to books, as much as books are engendered by ages and nations. The heroic grandeur of Greece inspired Homer; but it was from Homer that its civilization sprung."—p. 14.

After a brief account of the rise of the literature of France in the middle ages, and of the plastic influences which it received from Montaigne and Pascal, he follows it through the age of Louis XIV. to the eighteenth century. Of the literature of this century he thus speaks:

"The literary character of the eighteenth century is totally different: the

nation was beginning to embrace a cynical philosophy, destined to shake the social edifice to its very foundation. The ancient religion of the country was attacked with irreverence, and public opinion became deeply tainted with destructive dogmas, unredeemed by the healing principle of reconstruction. An intoxicating passion for change, for subversion, seized society: it was the effect of the execrable vices and despotism of the regency and of Louis XV. Two men, especially, became the representatives of the popular feeling, and therefore exercised a great influence on the eighteenth century, and indirectly a no less great one on the nineteenth. Voltaire had already assailed the empire of the classics, and Rousseau was preparing the basis whereon a new and distinct literature might be reared. Voltaire drew upon the resources of a matchless, inexhaustible wit; but Rousseau poured forth the effusions of a glowing yet morbid and incongruous sensibility: the former wrote profusely, merely to satisfy his thirst for glory, while the latter was stirred by the overflowing emotions of the heart. Voltaire by his works fostered the bias to infidelity, standing in the van of others, his compeers in impious sarcasm and ridicule; Rousseau seemed, on the contrary, to have consolations for even dismal skepticism; he exhorted to feelings of comparative piety, and to the ever-fruitful love of nature; the soul, in its attributes, affections, pangs, was his exalted theme, the subject that elicited the brightest emanations of his genius. Thus was heralded the mighty convulsion: the revolution burst forth in all its wildness, and France was suddenly hurled into anarchy and barbarism. Happily it was not of long duration; the reign of terror, indeed, covered the country with streams of blood, and overturned the social edifice; but soon after a new society, a youthful generation, arose from the ruins—a society of orphans, united by the common tie of misfortune, still bearing traces of tears in their smiles. Everything then took a graver aspect—a character more generous, certainly, but sombre in its hue; for France was covered with tombs."—pp. 16, 17.

The times of Napoleon, he sketches as follows:

"Under Bonaparte's sway, there was no time for literary progress; his incessant warfare was anything but favorable to the development of literary intellect, and a new literature, an *imperial* literature, could not rise suddenly at his fiat, as he actually desired, like a file of soldiers, the creatures of his will. Besides, the emperor's attention was more natu-

rally drawn towards the sciences, and his reign became the era of scientific prosperity. The revolution had taken the lives of Lavoisier and Bailly on the scaffold; but Napoleon delighted to draw around him and to honor such men as Monge, Laplace, Foureroy, Berthollet, and Lagrange. Yet his endeavors to form a literary court were all in vain; or, at best, it could but enumerate as its members, Arnault, author of *Germanicus*, Lemercier, author of *Agamemnon*, both classical dramatists, and a few others of the same order. The two great literary names of his time—the two who have left indelible traces on the nineteenth century—were, heart and soul, hostile to the usurpation and tyranny of the conqueror. I refer, of course, to M. de Chateaubriand and Madame de Staél.

"The noble and chivalrous character of M. de Chateaubriand deserves to be respected by all; and it is undeniable, that by his great work, *Le Génie du Christianisme*, France received a sacred stamp—a moral baptism, if I may be allowed so to speak, which the lower class of her literary population has vainly struggled to belie and to discard, by plunging into excesses most odious and revolting."—pp. 22, 23.

"Madame de Staél was endowed with a force and vigor of understanding, a power of psychological analysis, which gleam brightly even in her novel of *Corinne*, amidst a mass of unnatural, affected scenes, almost inconsistent with common sense. She stretched her faculties to seize and depict the secret and intimate emotions of the soul, pondering deeply on the religious impulse conveyed by Chateaubriand's devout and oriental imagery, and gave to the movement which he had already imparted to thought and feeling a powerful and happy stimulus. In short, she exercised an extraordinary influence over the literary revolution of the nineteenth century; nay, she, so eminently French in the chief characteristics of her mind and imagination, became the instrument whereby the sway of German genius has been partially riveted in France. *De l'Allemagne* is the work by which Madame de Staél attained a literary supremacy in her own country; it, beyond all others, overpowered the baneful influence of that mocking spirit and depreciating illiberality, which in France had long tended to check and fetter genius, rather than to invigorate morals or good taste."—p. 25.

He then refers to the influence of English writers upon France, particularly of Shakespeare, Ossian, Young and Lord Byron, and brings us down to the present state of

France, in its intellectual, moral and political condition.

He then gives to us the division of the field, under the following heads.—"Intellectual Philosophy, Political Tendencies, History, Criticism, Romance, Drama, and Poetry."

These are the topics on which he dwells at sufficient length, in the succeeding chapters. It will be seen from these heads, that the author's view of literature is in no sense narrow or limited, but that he makes it to include all that is written on any subject which interests the thoughts and feelings of men, except the mathematical and physical sciences.

The chapter on Intellectual Philosophy comes first in order, and is comprehensive and just. First we have a brief sketch of the Physiological or Sensualist School, next a more extended and what to most Americans, will be a novel view of the theologic or catholic school, as exhibited in the works of de Maistre, de Lammens, de Bonald, de Balanche and d'Eckstein, and last of all the rise and formation of the eclectic school. We do not acquiesce in all the author's conclusions, but his criticisms of the several schools are spirited and clear, and in the main are correct, while in them all the very intimate connection between the speculative opinions of the several schools of philosophy, and the principles of the people, is clearly indicated.

Chapters three and four, on Political Tendencies, will be read with great interest, for the light which they cast on the present condition of things. These chapters and the entire work were written before the revolution of February and the Republic; but the sketches which they give of the writers, who for forty years past have contended for absolutism on the one side, and for liberal principles on the other, are most instructive. They show us that the causes of the republic have been long

in preparation ; that they lie deeper than the accidental division of the chambers, or the unpopularity of a ministry, or the revolutionary fervor of the mob. In this chapter, M. de Bonald, Chateaubriand, Guizot, Paul Courier, Béranger, M. de Lamennais, St. Simon, Fourier, and above all, M. de Tocqueville, are the writers, to whom the highest importance is attached, as having, by successive strokes, or by a steady and continued influence, contributed to raise the thinking and sober portion of the French people, to a strong attachment for free institutions.

After noticing these distinguished writers at length, the author sketches more briefly, the struggles in the chambers after the restoration, and the leading men who though few but strong, upheld the cause of freedom against the crown. The most distinguished of these were Royer-Collard, Manuel, General Foy, and Benjamin Constant. He gives similar sketches of the leading statesmen since the revolution of 1830, particularly of M. Odillon Barrot, Casimir Perrier, Dupin, Guizot, Thiers, Arago and Berryer. The following passage is prophetic.

"We have spoken of the present opposition party in the Chamber of Deputies (the Chamber of Peers is a complete nullity). This party is the most popular in the nation ; it often counterbalances and vanquishes the conservative party, and the measures it has in view are of vital importance to France—the most vital of all, as we have said, the reform of the electoral system. The opposition in the French Chamber of Deputies is the expression of the democratic tendencies of France ; and it can not be doubted that, despite the resistance of M. Guizot, Count Molé, Marshal Soult, and others, it will in time triumphantly obtain all it contends for, and France will then be a complete democratic monarchy, unless any imprudence on the part of the crown or other enemies of democracy, provoke a new conflagration, which will probably be followed by a republic, by a European war, and by an immediate definitive struggle between the two principles, aristocracy and democracy."—p. 169.

The fifth chapter on criticism,  
VOL. VI.

opens with some just observations of the new office which criticism has assumed in modern times, and gives an extended notice of the most eminent philosophical critics which France has furnished, particularly of Villemain. Sketches of the most eminent writers for the periodical press, and a summary account of the French journals and newspapers conclude the chapter.

The sixth and seventh chapters are devoted to history. First are noticed the most eminent historians of the new or philosophical school of historians, together with an interesting narrative of the causes which led to the formation of this school. The most celebrated writers of this school, are Augustin Thierry, Guizot, Sismondi, and Dulaure. The literary career of each of these writers is described at some length, their several works are criticised, and their merits and defects are canvassed. The historians of the Fatalist school are then reviewed, of whom the most eminent are Thiers and Mignet. The peculiar principles of this school are characterised as they ought to be, by a Christian critic, in the following passage.

\* \* \* \* "The historians imbued with this principle, view all causes and effects as possessed of one character through a long course of years ; to them these seem, from their steady progression, to be independent of human action or control. An impulse appears to be given, which beats down resistance and sweeps away all means of opposition ; centuries succeed to centuries, and the philosopher sees the same influence still potent, still undeviating and regular ; to him, considering those ages at one view, following with rapid thought the slow pace of time, a century appears to dwindle to a point ; the individual obstructions and accelerations which within that period had occurred to impede or advance the *march of events*, as they say, are eliminated and forgotten. The mind dwells upon the necessity or fatality of the advance, and neglects what is all-important for practical purposes, namely, the consideration of how much, by human forethought, this certain improvement might have been aided. Thus the execrable excesses of the revolution are almost justified ; they

seem the result of a fatal necessity, without which French society could not have been regenerated. It will be readily understood that such a doctrine must lead the mind into frightful abysses. At every moment the fatalist historian speaks of the *entrainement irresistible* of revolutionary times—of those sanguinary vapors that intoxicate and paralyze the volition of man. Such tenets, such excessive fatalism, we hold to be equally immoral and false. The mission of the historian, as well as of the philosopher, is to inspire the human heart with the sacred idea of duty as bound up with liberty, and to endeavor at all times to exalt the dignity of man, by inculcating detestation of crime and admiration of virtue."—pp. 236-7.

The descriptive historians or the narrators are then described and named, and the innumerable writers of memoirs, &c. &c., are rapidly noticed and dismissed.

Chapter eighth is devoted to romance. In this chapter a very great number of writers are named and noticed; the few writers who have honored their genius by elevated principles and pure emotion are deservedly praised. The large number whose works are of a mixed character, and which are open to more or fewer exceptions, are criticised with just discrimination; and the very great number who have nothing to redeem their corruption, are spoken of as they deserve to be.

Chapters ninth and tenth treat of poetry and the drama, and are equally thorough and faithful with the others.

The notes appended by the American editor are many of them valuable, though their value is of a less permanent character than the text. Much of the information is not readily accessible. A single passage which indicates the religious sects with which the editor sympathizes, might have been spared with better taste.

One department of literature we fail to see, which the comprehensiveness of the author's plan would have required him to notice, if any such literature were to be found in France. We mean the department of theology. The theological wri-

ters of England and Germany, have furnished some of the noblest specimens of writing, which the language of either of these countries can show. Their commanding influence of their sharp discussions, of their eloquent sermons, of their meditative essays, and of their devotional poetry on particular generations, as well as upon the formation of the national character, can never be overlooked, by a truly thorough and liberal student of the history of either of these nations. Luther, Melanchthon, Hooker, Barrow, Taylor, Howe, Bates and Edwards of other generations—Herder, Schleiermacher, Hall, Chalmers and Dwight, of modern times, need only be named, to confirm the truth of this assertion. In these two countries, theology is regarded as "the haven and sabbath of man's contemplations," and the grandest theme of all his scientific inquiries. In France, it has never had existence as an independent science. The acuteness of Pascal and the eloquence of Bossuet and Massillon, are hardly exceptions to this remark, and besides, there are no Pascals and no Bossuets in modern France.

We hardly need advert to the cause. There can be no theology in a country such as France has been and yet continues to be. The double despotism that has settled down upon that country, since the sharp and fiery conflicts that followed the reformation, could not endure the presence of such an invisible yet powerful foe. It stood as ready at any moment, to repress and blight the first beginning of its life, as the guilty Herod was to strangle the infant Jesus. In doing so it not only cursed the nation, with the loss of civil liberty and of religious hopes, but it dwarfed its literature. For we hold it true, that without an invigorating theology, the higher kinds of literature dwindle and wither, and the lower, though they may reach an unmatched perfection in refine-

ment and grace, will yet lose their heartiness, their humor and their good sense.

It is with much cordiality that we greet this unpretending but valuable volume, and that we introduce it to our readers. We shall be greatly mistaken if many of those who read it will not think the better of French writers and of the French nation than they have done heretofore. We have been persuaded for many years, that the tone of thought and of principle has been steadily rising among the French people; and the evidence furnished by the great number of writers criticised in this volume, that there are myriads of readers among the middle and higher classes who are thoughtful in their views of men and of books, and who are made the wiser and better by what they read, is gratifying and hopeful. It is altogether impossible that a people who have demanded such a literature as is the modern literature of France, and who have been trained by this literature, should not have many of substantial men among its citizens, men who can be relied upon in the present crisis.

France is not all that it might be. We have no confident faith in the continuance of its republic—nor is it of much consequence to the lover of social and political freedom, whether in its present condition it shall be governed by a military and despotic president, or by one who is truly a citizen-king. But if France can have great and good writers and

educators, she will be fit to be free, and when she is fit to be free, she will be free indeed.

France needs most of all a religion. We do not believe her so atheistic and godless, as she is sometimes represented. The best of people are sometimes the most quiet, and there are doubtless many Frenchmen, of whom little is heard or said, both in the Catholic and Protestant churches, who seek after the Lord, if haply they may find him. Still, France is giddy, worldly, and thoughtless, and in the mass as we fear, far enough from God. But we have hope for her, not merely from the actual progress and success which attends efforts that are appropriately evangelical, but also in the increasing thoughtfulness and sobriety of the national mind, as shown in the more elevated character of its literature. We hope, in short, that as France thinks more earnestly, and is encouraged to think more earnestly by her writers, that both readers and writers will not only grope after the truth, but will be led back to the truth and to God. The change in this respect since the restoration, is surprising, and hopeful, and it prepares us to expect a revolution in France that will by and by occur, which shall be worth more than a thousand days like those of the twenty-third and twenty-fourth of February, and which shall demonstrate both to England and America, that France is worthy to be free.

#### LITERARY NOTICES.

*Peter Schlemihl in America.* Philadelphia: Carey & Hart. 1848. 12mo, pp. 494.

THIS book bears a borrowed title. Indeed the whole volume professes to be in some sort, a continuation of

the German tale by the same name. We do not greatly admire the management of the story, and should have been much better pleased, had the author set off in an entirely independent way, and contrived for himself new machinery, rather than

labored to employ an old story for new purposes. It would have been far better to leave Peter Schlemihl in Germany, than to attempt to transport him to America. Some excuse may be given for the author however, in the fact that he did not originally contemplate a volume, but only a series of *jeux d'esprit* for the Knickerbocker Magazine.

The object of the story is to launch the shafts of satire, at the follies of the time. In these follies the writer includes first and foremost the mysteries of fashionable life, with the high pretension, the stately inanity, and the vulgar and purse-proud arrogance, which are their common accompaniments, especially in the commercial metropolis, styled by our author, "Babylon the Less." These, however, are not the first object of his attack, but his aim is more serious and his mark one that is nobler and of higher consequence. The follies and freaks of opinion, which are current in this our hemisphere, especially of religious opinion, are seen to be the final end of the author's satire, and on these he expends the best of his strength. Accordingly, the solemn pretensions of Rome, grave as the inquisition, yet ridiculous as a bull from the vatican, are encountered with much array of learning and several tedious discussions. The equally ridiculous claims of the younger sister of Rome's younger sister—the high church pretensions of the American Episcopal church, which aims to wear with imposing effect, the old wigs and the faded canonicals that she borrows from the non-jurors of England, are set off with less theology, but with much better effect in the capital story of Rev. Dr. Verdant Green, and of Mrs. Van Dam's proposition for a second marriage. Dr. Dewey's church in Broadway, and the theology that it teaches, comes in for a share of the satire. The ablest portion of the volume, in our view, is the eleventh chapter, in which are

set forth the various shades of opinion adopted by those called liberal Christians. The extreme doctrines of Prof. Norton in regard to the Old Testament, the mysterious and oracular nothingness of the followers of Ralph Waldo Emerson, the painful enquiries and comfortless results of a circle of ladies, called free-inquirers, "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth," and the eloquent flatteries of one another by the "mutual admiration society" of a certain New England city, are all exhibited with some capital touches, with an occasional stroke of great power. We have rarely read a description that is more touching, than that of Helen Percy's death-bed. This Helen Percy represents an accomplished young lady, who had been trained to reject the historic truth of the gospel narrative, and the reality of Christ's supernatural mission. Alas! we fear that the melancholy story of this death-bed, will find its reality in more than one accomplished and amiable lady, and that if the thoughts and fears of the heart in many such cases were to be but spoken, they would reveal the same hopeless desolation and heart-broken agony. The visit to the Rock Creek community is done to the life, as every one will testify who has had personal knowledge of one of these establishments. As to the various scenes at the springs,—the love-making, the elopements, and the happy marriages at the end, if they are all well, there is too much of a good thing. It strikes us also, that the author is a little more theological and sectarian in his phraseology than is desirable for a book, which is to be read in various religious circles, and by men and women of no faith in particular.

*The Crescent and the Cross; or Romance and Realities of Eastern Travel;* by ELIOT WARBURTON, Esq. New edition, complete in one volume. New York: Geo.

P. Putnam, 155 Broadway. 1848.  
2 parts in one volume, pp. 268  
and 242.

THIS work has already been before the public, as one of the series styled "the Library of Choice Reading." It is now issued separately by Mr. Putnam, and is presented in a form additionally attractive. Those who have read the work will readily greet it, as one of the most brilliant and fascinating of modern books, in which the scholar and the gentleman, the sportsman and the English Tory, are as attractively represented, as is possible. The author gives us his observations, with a heartiness which is always exciting. He does not spare us his prejudices, which are not however offensive. His insight into the things that deserve notice is unusual. His discrimination in selecting the points worth describing is peculiar, and the spirit of his narration is admirable.

He begins at Southampton, at which port he takes passage in an oriental steamer for Alexandria. He gives us life at sea, and his passing observations upon Gibraltar, Algiers and Malta. He detains us at Alexandria, then conducts us to Cairo, of which he gives an extended account, with full observations on the men and things which are to be seen in Egypt. Then we have life upon the Nile, in detail, with copious descriptions of what is to be seen along its banks. Nubia is next noticed, and Cairo is visited a second time. After these, Syria, Mt. Lebanon, Jerusalem, the most conspicuous places in the Holy Land, the Dead Sea, Damascus, Constantinople and Greece, occupy a second part.

Few books carry the reader more pleasantly along, sustain and reward his interest more uniformly, and leave him with a more pleasant impression. And yet you never forget that the author is in body, soul and spirit, an Englishman.

*An Oration delivered before the Society of Phi Beta Kappa, at Cambridge, August 24, 1848. By HORACE BUSHNELL. Cambridge: George Nichols. 1848. 8vo, pp. 39.*

OUR friends at Cambridge are famous, we believe, for the pleasant manner in which they manage their literary festivals. Grace, refinement and wit, with a gentle excitement of the intellect, are very justly esteemed by them as essential requisites. When then a grave Connecticut divine appeared to furnish the entertainment, they must have trembled with not a little apprehension, lest he should not be equal to the occasion. They would not perhaps be afraid of the heterodoxy of his opinions, but their hereditary and traditional impressions, in respect to the sourness of the Connecticut scholars, might lead them to fear lest he should give them too much of a sermon. If any of them indulged in these fears, they were doubtless speedily relieved after Dr. Bushnell commenced his oration. We trust they were better pleased with the playfulness of this performance, than they are likely to be with his theology, unless he shall convert them to Connecticut ways of thinking.

The theme of this address, is Work and Play, which we observe, is carefully excluded from the title-page, and is rather mysteriously hidden from the reader by a somewhat studied introduction. We should not like to be answerable for the philosophical correctness of the distinction, which has somewhat more of the aspect of a conceit, than of a well grounded and accurate definition.

But apart from these, it serves very well to string together a variety of beautiful descriptions, of forcible and striking observations, on the pursuit of wealth, the drama, war, courage, literary genius, poet-

ry, eloquence, philosophy, and the Christian faith. Each of these themes is made to follow the other by a fine gradation of thought, and the moral and religious tone of the whole is nobly sustained. We extract the following, as having pleased us, for the felicity of its painting.

"Now the living races are seen, at a glance, to be offering in their history, everywhere, a faithful type of his own. They show him what he himself is doing and preparing,—all that he finds in the manifold experience of his own higher life. They have all their gambols, all their sober cares and labors. The lambs are sporting on the green knoll, the anxious dams are bleating to recall them to their side. The citizen beaver is building his house by a laborious carpentry, and the squirrel is lifting his sail to the wind on the swinging top of the tree. In the music of the morning, he hears the birds playing with their voices, and, when the day is up, sees them sailing round in circles on the upper air, as skaters on a lake, folding their wings, dropping and rebounding, as if to see what sport they can make of the solemn laws that hold the upper and lower worlds together. And yet these play-children of the air he sees again descending to be carriers and drudges, fluttering and screaming anxiously about their nest, and confessing by that sign that not even wings can bear them clear of the stern doom of work. On passing to some quiet shade, meditating still on this careworn life, playing still internally with ideal fancies and desires unrealized, there returns upon him there, in the manifold and spontaneous mimicry of nature, a living show of all that is transpiring in his own bosom,—in every flower, some bee humming over his laborious chemistry and loading his body with the fruits of his toil,—in the slant sunbeam, populous nations of moles quivering with animated joy, and catching, as in play, at the golden particles of the light with their tiny fingers. Work and play, in short, are the universal ordinance of God for the living races, in which they symbolize the fortune and interpret the errand of man. No creature lives that must not work and may not play."—pp. 5, 6.

*A History of New York, from the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty;* containing among many surprising and curious matters, the unutterable ponderings of Walter the Doubter, the disastrous projects

of William the Testy, and the chivalric achievements of Peter the Headstrong—the three Dutch Governors of New Amsterdam: being the only authentic history of the times that ever hath been or ever will be published. By DIEDRICH KNICKERBOCKER. The author's revised edition. Complete in one volume. New York: Geo. P. Putnam, 155 Broadway, and 142 Strand, London. 1848.

MR. PUTNAM is now publishing a complete edition of the works of Washington Irving—works which ought to be in the hands of every American family. Knickerbocker's History of New York, the first of the series, has already appeared, and does honor in its execution to the taste of the enterprising publisher. It is printed on the best paper, with type beautifully clear and distinct, and its binding is neat and elegant. Scarcely anything can be said in praise of the distinguished author, which would not be a mere repetition of that which has often been said before; yet we may be permitted to notice the acknowledged beauty of his style, which we think has never been excelled, and his graceful wit, which plays as brightly yet as harmlessly as the northern lights. New Amsterdam as it existed in the days of its renowned rulers, Walter the Doubter, William the Testy, and Peter the Headstrong—its tranquil Dutch burghers and their notable wives, furnished a fit occasion for the display of both these qualities, and its history is a suitable introduction to an edition of the writings of Irving.

#### *The Planetary and Stellar Worlds.*

By O. M. MITCHELL, A.M., Director of the Cincinnati Observatory. New York: Baker & Scribner. 1848.

To those who listened to the eloquent lectures comprised in this

volume as they were delivered in Boston, New York, Brooklyn, and in other cities, no commendation of them can be necessary. We have never heard a lecturer who, without the aid of an orrery or of diagrams, made the great facts of astronomy so perfectly intelligible to a popular assembly, as did Mr. Mitchell in his brief course; nor have we ever listened to a more delightful flow of language—the simple and lucid language of science, and yet the lofty and glowing language of poetry—than was poured forth in these lectures, without manuscript or note, as if it were the spontaneous effusion of the speaker's soul.

The perseverance of Mr. Mitchell in erecting his Observatory under difficulties and at an amount of personal sacrifice which few men would have endured for the mere love of science, his zeal in the path of observation and discovery, and his devotion to American science, entitle him and his works to the favorable regard of the public.

This volume is what it professes to be, "a popular exposition of the great discoveries and theories of modern astronomy;" illustrated with several fine plates of telescopic views. It should have a place in every family.

---

*Elements of Meteorology, with Questions for Examination, designed for the use of Schools and Academies.* By JOHN BROCKLESBY, A.M., Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in Trinity College, Hartford. New York: Pratt & Woodford. 1848. 240 pp., 12mo.

METEOROLOGY is defined to be *that branch of natural science, which treats of the atmosphere and its phenomena.* The author of this work, appropriately distributes his subject into six different parts—the Atmosphere, in general, and Aerial, Elec-

trical, Optical, and Luminous phenomena, respectively. He justly observes, that the subject is one of universal interest. It embraces one of the most elegant departments of natural philosophy, and conducts the reader through a part of the creation peculiarly illustrative of the handiwork of the Creator. It is, at the same time, one of the most practical of the natural sciences, dealing, as it does, with that kind of knowledge which, in a peculiar degree, comes home to men's business and bosoms. The description of that aerial covering which invests the earth, and at once envelops and sustains all animated nature; the phenomena and causes of winds, hurricanes, tornadoes, and water-spouts; of rain, fogs, clouds, dew, snow, and hail; of electricity and thunder-storms; of the rainbow, mirage, and halos; of meteorites, shooting stars, and aurora borealis; the philosophy which discourses of these familiar objects, so constantly under the observation, and so intimately associated with the comfort and happiness of every member of the human family, must evidently address itself alike to readers of every class.

Since the treatises on meteorology published many years since by Kirwan and Dalton, the elements of this science have been seldom presented in a form suited to the general reader. Minute details of experiments, refined descriptions of apparatus, dry tabular records of observations, and fine spun theories, have too often rendered elementary works on meteorology repulsive to the unscientific reader, who is usually desirous merely of the useful *results* of such investigations, and concerns himself but little with the recondite methods by which those results were obtained. Professor Brocklesby has rendered a useful service to the reading world, by presenting them with a treatise on the atmosphere and its phenomena,

which abounds in interesting and useful facts, and, at the same time, affords an easy and intelligible explanation of the laws of atmospheric phenomena.

This is the first separate work of the kind we have seen, which in form, style, and matter, appears well adapted for a school-book; and we cordially commend it to the friends of popular education, and especially to the teachers of our schools and academies, as a work not less deserving of their attention, nor less appropriate for a class-book, than those which, we are happy to say, are conveying to all classes of American youth the valuable truths of astronomy, chemistry, natural philosophy, physiology, geology, and several other branches of the study of nature.

*The History of the Reformation, in the Church of Christ, from the close of the Fifteenth Century.* By THOMAS GAILLARD. pp. 557, 8vo. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1847.

IT seems almost presumptuous for any man to write a popular history of the Reformation contemporaneously with D'Aubigné. But the wide diffusion of the sprightly volumes of the Geneva Professor has begotten a taste for works of this class. The history before us, is the production of a gentleman of Alabama, who seems disposed to improve his leisure with interest to himself and profit to the public. We infer, from the preface, that this is the second in a series of volumes; but we do not remember to have seen the first. The writer is evidently an earnest Calvinist and Presbyterian, and, though generally candid, sometimes mistakes opinion for fact. He makes too free use of his authorities. Instead of interweaving his facts in one continuous narrative, he gives us page after page of quotations. This makes the work at

times dry and heavy, and destroys its symmetry. Mr. G. should have thrown his own mind more fully into the history—should have lived among the scenes of which he writes—and then he would have made them live before us. The work, on the whole, however, is creditable to his industry and genius. It covers an interesting period. It traces the progress of the Reformation for two centuries, in Germany, France, England, Scotland, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and the north of Europe, and sketches its brief course in Italy and Spain. We shall look with interest for the promised volume on the Huguenots.

*Sermons and Addresses on various subjects.* By Rev. D. L. CARROL, D.D. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1846. 12mo, pp. 372.

*Sermons and Addresses, &c.* By Rev. D. L. CARROL, D.D. (Second Series.) Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1847. 12mo, pp. 387.

THE author of these volumes is well known to the public, as having been a successful pastor and preacher in several important stations. He has, as he tells us in the preface to the second of these volumes, been "set aside, from the active duties of the holy office," his hopes are cut off, and he is now steadily advancing "to the house appointed for all the living." These volumes have been given to the public, that he might enjoy the happiness of believing that he is still preaching the gospel, and also, that he might realize something for the supply of his pecuniary wants, in that painful situation which too commonly follows a laborious and self-sacrificing ministry.

These sermons, as far as we have examined them, are clear, lively, faithful, and occasionally eloquent. No man who purchases these vol-

umes, will fail to receive volumes which will do good to himself and his household, and be will exercise the grace, which is "twice blessed," which "blesseth him that gives and him that takes."

*Sprinkling the only Mode of Baptism made known in the Scriptures; and the Scripture Warrant for Infant Baptism.* By ABSALOM PETERS, D.D. Albany: E. H. Pease & Co. 18mo, pp. 184.

DR. PETERS, formerly the editor of the Biblical Repository, now the much respected pastor of the First Church in Williamstown, Mass., has given to the public in this little volume, a very luminous statement of the commonly received doctrine in regard to the mode and the subjects of baptism. He does not pretend to entire originality in the argument. He acknowledges his obligations to those who have preceded him in the discussion of the same subject, and particularly to Dr. Edward Beecher and Dr. Edwin Hall. One great merit of his book is the clear and convincing manner in which he brings the argument home to the popular apprehension. He makes it plain, not to scholars only, but to all readers of the Bible. There is no other book which we would more readily or confidently put into the hands of a plain man asking for information about the mode or the subjects of baptism.

*Young Men admonished; in a series of Lectures.* By JOSEPH P. THOMPSON, Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church. New York: Leavitt, Trow & Co. 12mo, pp. 278.

THE lectures in this volume are seven in number, and are on the following subjects:—"Temptations to dishonesty," "Temptations to intemperance," "Temptations to

VOL. VI.

76

gambling," "Profaneness and Sabbath-breaking," "Living for pleasure," "Vice progressive," and "The Bible the young man's guide." Our readers are well acquainted with Mr. Thompson, and are prepared to receive with favor the volume which he now offers to the public. The book is one which every young man exposed to the temptations of a city, ought to read. Let every parent who sends a son to a shop or counting-house in New York, or Boston, or Philadelphia, or any such place, put a copy of these earnest admonitions into his trunk with his Bible.

*The Illustrated Family Christian Almanac, for 1849.* Published by the American Tract Society.

THIS is one of the marvels of this marvelous age! We remember, for years, buying Almanacs, at 12½ cents each, which had but 12 pages, and those of dingy paper, and miserable print, and containing only the calendar, and a few silly anecdotes. But here, for 6 cents each, or 3 cents by the thousand, is a beautifully printed Almanac, of 60 pages, and 13 handsome illustrations, filled with select reading on almost every topic, and containing, also, statistics of the highest value on various important subjects. And what is more, these statistics are not antiquated, stereotyped statements of what once might have been, but now no longer are facts, but statistics from original sources, and brought up to present dates. This last feature we deem the most valuable of the work; and the Tract Society deserves the highest credit for thus spreading before its numerous friends and patrons, reliable information on topics of so much interest and moment to all. We trust this admirable little work will find its way to hundreds of thousands of readers, conveying not merely the knowledge of the seasons, but the lessons of divine truth.

*Colleges and Cottage Life*; containing plans for country houses, adapted to the means and wants of the people of the United States; with directions for building and improving; for the laying out and embellishing of grounds; with some sketches of life in this country. By C. W. ELLIOTT. Cincinnati: W. W. Derby & Co., publishers. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1848.

THIS handsome volume must be welcomed by all those who are seeking to realize their ideas of a rural paradise—the object of the hopes and plans of so many of the weary devotees of business. There is much beauty in the whole execution of the work—in the drawing, the engraving, and the text, all of which are by one hand. The main body of the book is a series of pictures of country life, woven together in an entertaining story, the scenes of which are associated with the different engravings. The illustrations, of which there are sixteen, give specimens of country houses, varying in costliness from \$600 to \$20,000. Any of them would be agreeable objects in a landscape, and would help to form the taste of the neighborhood.

The author has the eye of a poet, an artist, and a true lover of nature; and his book can not fail to promote a love for those refined pleasures which it recommends.

It is a timely contribution to the wants which increasing wealth and refinement are creating, and will be instrumental in communicating a degree of the taste in which it was conceived and executed.

*Theopneusty, or the Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.* By S. R. L. GAUSSEN, Professor of Theology in Geneva, Switzerland. Translated by EDWARD NORRIS KIRK. Third American from the second French edition,

enlarged and improved by the author. New York: John S. Taylor.

THE fact that a third edition of this work has been called for in so short a time, is good evidence of its popularity. The author is one of the ablest advocates of that theory of inspiration which he has espoused.

*Travels in Peru, during the years 1838-1842—on the Coast, in the Sierra, across the Cordilleras and the Andes, into the Primeval Forests.* By Dr. J. J. VON TSCHUDI. Translated from the German, by THOMASINA Ross. New edition; complete in one volume. New York: George P. Putnam, 155 Broadway. 1848. pp. 354.

*The Spaniards and their Country.* By RICHARD FORD, author of the *Handbook of Spain*. New edition; complete in one volume. New York: Geo. P. Putnam. 1848. pp. 349.

BOTH these volumes have been already published in the Library of Choice Reading, and are now re-issued. The attractiveness of the countries of which they treat, and the very great favor with which they have been received, authorize us to recommend them to our readers, as the latest and best books of travels in these comparatively inaccessible and unknown regions.

*Posthumous and other Poems.* By CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH. New York: M. W. Dodd.

MRS. TONNA was not so successful in verse, as in prose; but the spirit that breathes through all her writings, will secure for them a lasting influence. This little volume presents us with a pleasing variety of pieces, chiefly meditative and devotional.

## OBITUARY NOTICE OF REV. EDWARD R. TYLER.

THE readers of the New Englander have already been informed of the decease of the Rev. Mr. Tyler, the proprietor and principal conductor of this journal. His surviving associates regard it as a duty to their readers and to the memory of their departed friend, to occupy a few of the pages which remained unprinted at the time of his death, with some account of his life.

EDWARD ROYALL TYLER was a New Englander of the old stock. His earliest American ancestor, *Thomas Tyler*, a sea captain, emigrated from Budleigh in Devonshire, two centuries ago, to Boston in Massachusetts, where he married, and had four sons whose offspring were numerous and respectably connected. *William Tyler*, Esq., the second son of Thomas, and the great-grandfather our deceased friend, was a respected citizen and magistrate of Boston. He was the father of a numerous family, and educated three of his sons at Harvard College. The Hon. *Rogall Tyler*, the third son of William, received a degree at Harvard in 1748, was a member of the Council of Massachusetts under the royal government, and died in 1771, leaving two sons, *John Steele Tyler*, who was a colonel in the revolutionary war, and *Rogall Tyler*, who distinguished himself as a citizen and a jurist in the state of Vermont.

The last named in this genealogy was the father of Edward R. Tyler. He graduated at Harvard College, with the highest honors, in 1776, and devoted himself to the profession of law. In that profession he established himself first at Guilford, in Vermont. Afterwards he removed to the adjoining town of Brattleboro, where he died highly esteemed more than twenty years ago. He was Chief Justice of Vermont, and was known as an author. His wife, the mother of our deceased associate,

was a daughter of Gen. Joseph Pearse Palmer, and grand-daughter of Gen. Joseph Palmer, whose biography is given in the third volume of this work. She is still living at Brattleboro, much esteemed and beloved for the excellence of her character. Of their eleven children, the eldest son died at the age of nineteen, when about to graduate at the University of Vermont; and the youngest died in 1831, at the age of thirteen. The third death among the children is that which has just occurred. Of the five surviving sons, two are clergymen in the Protestant Episcopal church, and one in the Presbyterian.

The subject of this notice was born at Guilford, Vermont, on the 3d of August, 1800. He passed the years of childhood there and at Brattleboro. In the expectation of being devoted to business pursuits, he was placed as a clerk in a counting house in the city of New York. But before he had passed out of his minority, that great change took place within him, which wakened him to higher aspirations, and led him into new pursuits. Under the preaching and pastoral care of the Rev. Dr. Spring, his religious character became clear and decided; and he was encouraged to enter upon a course of study with reference to the work of the ministry. After the necessary preparatory studies, he was admitted to the Freshman class in Yale College in 1821, when he had already entered his twenty-second year.

In college he was eminent as a scholar. He was one of the first three in a class of seventy. At the same time he was distinguished for the consistency and manly activity of his religious character. In the last year of his college course, he was the monitor of the Freshmen class, and in that capacity was led to take

a special interest in their moral and spiritual welfare. His kind and earnest efforts to do them good will never be forgotten. Some of his own classmates too, will always remember the conversations in which he endeavored to impress upon their minds the necessity of their being reconciled to God through Christ.

Having taken his degree at the close of his academic course in 1825, he immediately commenced the study of theology, being employed at the same time as a teacher in Cambridgeport, Mass. Early in 1826, he went to Andover, where he resided the greater part of a year, pursuing his theological studies, but without any formal connection with the Seminary. Having been regularly commended to the churches as a candidate for the ministry, he entered upon the work of preaching, about two years after his graduation at Yale College. In December, 1827, he was ordained pastor of the South Congregational Church in Middletown, Conn.

As a pastor, Mr. Tyler soon showed himself a workman that need not be ashamed. There were some peculiarities in the field which he occupied, which made his work more arduous than that of an ordinary pastor. The church in which he accepted the pastoral office, was formed by secession from several neighboring churches in the progress of the excitement and schisms which attended "the great awakening" of 1740 and the following years. From the beginning, it renounced the peculiar constitution and confederation of Connecticut Congregationalism, and insisted upon a strict independency as its inalienable privilege. Its relations, therefore, to neighboring churches had not been such as to give it any external strength. Though eighty years had elapsed since its origin, its growth had been on the whole quite inconsiderable. The settlement of Mr. Tyler was the beginning of a new era in the history of that church.

By the blessing of God upon his labors, it began to prosper outwardly and spiritually. Strengthened by the accession of young and enterprising men, the society attempted the building of a new house of worship; and the building was completed partly by the aid which other churches gave in answer to his solicitation. In 1831, the church shared largely in the quickening movement which made that year memorable in so many churches; and he saw the success of his labors and the answer to his prayers.

His ministry at Middletown was interrupted by ill health; and in less than five years from the date of his ordination, he was compelled to resign the pastoral office. Relieved from official responsibility, he was soon encouraged with the promise of returning health; and after a few months he accepted a call from the church in Colebrook, Conn., where he was installed pastor in February, 1833. But his constitutional tendency to disease soon manifested itself again; and in June, 1836, his resignation of that pastoral charge was accepted and ratified.

For some time before his dismission from Colebrook, his mind had been much occupied with the questions then agitated in relation to slavery. The reaction in some quarters against the disorganizing ultraisms of some ill-taught reformers—the outcry of alarm and expostulation which proceeded from the best men at the south—and the zeal with which politicians of all parties emulated each other in paying homage to slavery as a political power—awakened in many minds a reasonable apprehension as to what might be the permanent effect of all this upon the public opinion of the free states. At such a crisis, Mr. Tyler thought he might do good by laboring to promote thorough views of the injustice and the anti-Christian character of slavery. In this hope, he accepted an appointment as agent for the American Anti-Slavery So-

society. He continued in that employment till near the close of the following year. The nature of the service, withdrawing him in a great measure from sedentary occupation, and sending him from place to place, proved favorable to his health; and he began to feel a natural longing for some other employment which would restore him to his companionship with books, and to the enjoyment of his family and home.

Such an employment he found in the editorial care of the Connecticut *Observer*, a weekly journal which had been published for some twelve years at Hartford, and which was to some extent under the patronage of the Congregational pastors of Connecticut. He became the editor of the *Observer* from the first of January, 1838. But in the month of December, just as he was preparing to remove to Hartford, he was brought quite low by an attack of acute disease, from which he had not sufficiently recovered when he hastened to enter on his new employment. The excitement, the unaccustomed labor, the care, and some troubles which he had hardly expected, were more than his enfeebled frame was able to sustain; and the consequence was that his health was permanently impaired. Yet his efforts under all his discouragements were in a high degree acceptable and useful. And when the publication of the *Observer* was relinquished in 1842, he had "purchased for himself a good degree" in the confidence of the pastors and churches of Connecticut. Some in whose minds his connection with the Anti-Slavery Society had operated to his disadvantage, saw and acknowledged the excellence of the man. His influence, so far as it reached, had operated to soften and remove any asperity of feeling between those who differed from each other in regard to the anti-slavery organization and its measures.

At the time when he relinquished the publication of the Connecticut

*Observer*, the consultations were already in progress which resulted in the establishment of the *New Englander*. The projectors of the work committed it to his guidance as proprietor and editor; for indeed he had been in their councils from the beginning. He began in circumstances of discouragement. A serious pecuniary loss, which came upon him unexpectedly after he had entered into engagements for the publication of the work, embarrassed his proceedings and depressed his spirits. In spite of all that we could do to lighten his editorial labors and to promote the success of the undertaking, his health failed rapidly till, for a considerable period, his life was despaired of. The force and elasticity of his mind, his judgment, his courage, and his power of thought, shared in the infirmity of his body. At last, in the summer of 1846, reduced to an absolute incapacity of pursuing the enterprise, he disposed of a part in the proprietorship of the work, and left his home in New Haven, little expecting ever to enter it again. He went to his mother's house in Brattleboro with only a faint hope that a complete release from all business responsibility, and the invigorating influence of his native air, together with the peculiar remedial treatment of the water-cure establishment in that village, might afford him relief. Beyond his own expectations, and to the grateful surprise of his friends, he recovered, in the course of some three or four months, a degree of health in body and mind which he had not enjoyed for years before. The devout gratitude with which he acknowledged that great deliverance, can not be described in any way so well, as by transcribing here some passages from a letter which he addressed at the time to one of the friends with whom he was associated in the direction of this journal. The letter is dated, "Brattleboro, Sept. 25, 1846."

"As Providence has made you

my pastor, I shall take the liberty to be very frank in what I have to say respecting myself. Having been an invalid for eight years, and having passed through several courses of dangerous sickness, it seems to me a wonderful providence that a constitution is left which promises to be restored to perfect soundness and vigor. When I left home, ten weeks since, I was unable to walk steadily without aid, and had to be helped into the coach which carried me to the railroad station. Now I can walk for miles without weariness, jump, run, and climb mountains; and I enjoy a sensation of health to which I have been a stranger for years. I am not yet encouraged to believe that any permanent improvement has been made, unless I follow up my present course of bathing and exercise for a few months longer; but I am already capable of acting with a bodily and mental vigor and pleasure, of which I have not been conscious till now for a long period. But this, I trust, is not the best half of my report. At the time I left New Haven, and for weeks after that, my mind was in a state bordering on despair. Not an object, past, present or future, could I discover on which my thoughts rested with satisfaction. No appointment or dispensation of Divine providence pleased me. I was unsubmissive to the trials and afflictions with which a just, wise and good God had seen best to reprove me. In short, I know not how better to describe my state of feeling than to say, rather indefinitely, that a 'horror of great darkness' rested on my mind. This distress has been succeeded by what I fear may be a delusion, but a most surprising change, for which I can not be sufficiently grateful to the Savior of men. I can not now say that I am unhappy, or unwilling that all Divine appointments should stand. My misfortunes are all merciful, and my blessings transcendently above my deserts. But I will not weary you with any details." After some ex-

pression of thanks to his associates for what they had done during his illness, "to save the New Englander from destruction," and of his "hope that it may yet survive to be the instrument of great good," he closes his letter by saying, "I even begin to hope that I shall yet be able once more to preach the glorious gospel of the blessed God,—a pleasure which I had quite despaired of ever again realizing."

The hope expressed in the closing sentence of the letter, was not entirely disappointed. After his return from Brattleboro, his health was such that he ventured to preach occasionally—though his efforts of that kind were for the most part in congregations to which he might preach without any great physical exhaustion. During the last summer, he spoke in public more freely and frequently than he had done for many years before. Some six weeks before his death, he ventured to supply the place of the pastor, for a single Sabbath, in the Broadway Tabernacle in New York. The effort appears to have been too great for his strength. It was followed by a slight cough and hoarseness, with some perceptible diminution of his bodily vigor. Still there was no alarm,—he seemed only to have taken cold; though some of his friends feared that he might be relapsing into his old complaints.

On Thursday, the 28th of September, in the morning, a physician was called, who had long been accustomed to prescribe for him; but a medical examination of his case discovered no occasion for special anxiety. In the afternoon of that day, at about half past three o'clock, he suddenly fell into a state of unconsciousness; and at half past six he had ceased to live. It is believed that his death was caused by an attack of gout, and that the same disease which in various disguised forms had followed him for many years, had finished its work at last by striking at the lungs. To him,

his death was as sudden as the announcement of it in the newspapers was to his friends.

Mr. Tyler's contributions to this work have made our readers acquainted with his qualities as a writer. In the first volume he was the author of the articles on 'Capital Punishment,' on 'Lying,' on 'Wesleyan Perfectionism,' on 'Governor Yale,' and on 'The Relations of Man to the Moral Law.' In the second volume, the article on 'Promises' was the only one of any length the state of his health permitted him to contribute. For the same reason, the first three numbers of the third volume contained nothing from him but some slight notices of books; but in the concluding number the articles on 'Unitarian and Episcopalian Affinities,' on 'The Right of Civil Government over Life,' and on 'The Comparative Character and Merits of the Congregational and Presbyterian Systems'—are an indication that just then he was less than ordinarily under the power of disease. In the fourth volume, the three articles on 'Stuart's Apocalypse,' on 'The Bible a Revelation,' and on 'The Theory of the Christian Church and Ministry,' were from his pen. To the fifth volume, he contributed the articles on 'The Cold Water Cure,' on 'The Good Time Coming,' on 'The Causes and Cure of Puseyism,' on 'Torrey's Translation of Neander,' on 'The Extension of the Elective Franchise to the Colored Citizens of the Free States,' on 'The Ex-parte Council at Reading, Massachusetts,' and on 'The Kingdom of Heaven.' To the volume which we are closing with this brief memorial of him, he has contributed the articles on 'The Proposed Abolition of Slavery in West Virginia,' on 'The Church—as it was, as it is, and as it ought to be,' and on 'The Ethics of Religious Controversy.'

The mere recital of the subjects of these articles, is a sort of index to the habits and tendencies of his mind and to the favorite direction of

his studies. With a large and liberal mind, and with a ready talent for investigation and discussion in various departments of inquiry, he delighted chiefly in ethical studies—in that broad sense of the word ethical, which includes the relations of human conduct not only to the welfare of society, but also to the will and government of God. We remember indeed, that several years ago, after his retirement from the pastoral office, he employed himself for a season in writing a system of Moral Philosophy, which was nearly ready to be printed, when he entered into other engagements. Some of the ablest among the articles above mentioned, may perhaps be recognized as chapters detached from that unfinished work.

Mr. Tyler's authorship was not limited to his connection with the periodical press. About a year after his settlement in the pastoral office at Middletown, he published a volume on the Christian doctrine of Future Punishment. Of that little volume, we hesitate not to say, that for simplicity and perspicuity of scriptural argument, and for the earnest force of common sense with which the conclusions are commended to the understanding and the sense of right, it is not surpassed by any popular work on the same subject within our knowledge. It deserves a new edition for extensive circulation. A few months later, he published a Sermon, maintaining the proposition that "God always prefers obedience to sin in its stead." To those who do not remember the position of our New England metaphysical theology twenty years ago, it would seem as if arguments on such a proposition before a Christian congregation must have been quite preposterous. Yet it is veritable history, that less than twenty years ago there were theologians in New England, of unquestionable piety and ability, whose reverence for God was so perverted by metaphysics, and their understanding of the

plainest Scripture representations so mystified, that they were ready not only to deny such a proposition, but to count a man almost a heretic for affirming it. Such a fact ought to be remembered as a testimony against the folly of attempting to construct a system of theology, out of the heartless inferences of metaphysical logic. Another of Mr. Tyler's publications was an elaborate sermon vindicating the doctrine of Election as held by modern Calvinists, against the objections of the Wesleyan Arminians. He published in 1836, a pamphlet on the moral character of slavery. His latest separate publication was the Congregational Catechism. This work is well known to our readers generally. A brief outline of it is given in the New Englander, Vol. II, pp. 180-182. A more thorough exhibition of the argument for the primitive, Congregational church order, can not be found in so narrow a compass as in this little book.\*

Mr. Tyler was twice married. His first wife, whom he married in May, 1828, was Anne, daughter of Rev. James Murdock, D.D., then of Andover. At the time of their marriage she was in feeble health; and she continued in her father's family, suffering and declining till June, 1830, when she died at New Haven. Afterwards, in July, 1831, he married Sarah Ann, daughter of Deacon Joseph Boardman of Middletown. Of the six children of this marriage, five are living to share with their mother in the sorrow of the house which his death has darkened. May they find in God's care and faithfulness an unfailing portion!

In closing this account of one with whom we have had a long acquaint-

\* We subjoin the titles of the works above enumerated, excepting the pamphlet on slavery, of which we have no copy. *Lectures on Future Punishment.* 12mo. pp. 180. Middletown. 1829. *Holiness Preferable to Sin: A Sermon.* 8vo. pp. 27. New Haven. 1829. *The Doctrine*

ance, and whom we have known in circumstances well fitted to show what was in him, we may be allowed to express our personal sense of his worth. As to the natural endowments of his mind, and the extent to which they had been cultivated by the discipline of study, the readers of the New Englander need no testimony from us; for they themselves have had opportunity to know him, though they have had little knowledge of the disadvantages under which he has labored, and the physical depression under which most of his articles have been written. But we have known him in more intimate relations. We have seen his uncomplaining patience, his uniform cheerfulness, his imperturbable kindness, his genial sympathy, his generous impulses, his simple and childlike piety. We have seen him living year after year at death's door, struggling with care and embarrassment, working on manfully under depressing disappointments, while disease was drinking up his spirit. He was by nature, by culture, and by the grace of God, one of the best sort of men—not one of those who have no instinct that revolts from meanness—not one of those "whose hearts are dry as summer's dust,"—not one of those to whom friendship is a matter of calculation and convenience—but one of those in whom the elements of character, well tempered by nature, and refined by culture, are ennobled by faith and sanctified by devotion. When such men are removed by death from the circle of our friendships, we feel how much we loved them, and are ready to reproach ourselves that we have not loved them more.

of Election: A Sermon. 8vo. pp. 28. New Haven. 1831. *The Congregational Catechism, containing a General Survey of the Organization, Government and Discipline of Christian Churches.* 18mo. pp. 137. New Haven. 1844.









32101 065273144

